arXiv:1512.04218v6 [math.PR] 20 Jul 2016

CROSSINGS STATES AND SETS OF STATES IN PÓLYA RANDOM WALKS

VYACHESLAV M. ABRAMOV

Abstract. We consider the Pólya random walk in $\mathbb{Z}^d$. We assume that it starts from the origin and after some excursion returns to the original point again. Given this condition, the paper establishes a number of results for the conditional probability distributions and expectations of the number of usual (undirected) and specifically defined in the paper up- and down-directed state-crossings and different sets of states crossings. One of the most important results of this paper is that for the Pólya random walk, the conditional expectation of the number of state-crossings is equal to 1 for any state $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$.

1. Introduction

Simple-symmetric random walk is a well-known object of the study in probability theory (see Spitzer [8]) and also known as Pólya random walk. In 1921 Pólya [6] proved that a simple symmetric random walk of dimension one or two is recurrent, i.e. being started from the origin, it returns to the original point infinitely many times, but of dimension higher than two it is not recurrent (see also Novak [5] for alternative proof). The further known results on Pólya random walks can be found in [9] and in the references there. Recently, the author [1] extended the Pólya theorem for a family of symmetric random walks.

The presents paper considers Pólya random walks and studies the conditional probability distributions of the number of usual (undirected) and specifically defined (directed) state-crossings, given that being started from the origin, the random walk returns to the same original point. The results of the present paper are independent of all of the aforementioned publications and fully self-contained. The necessary definitions of undirected state-crossings, different type directed state-crossings, and other related concepts are given later in the paper.

The time parameter t is a discrete (integer) parameter. At time $t = 0$, the random walk starts from $\mathbf{0}$, where $\mathbf{0}$ denotes the d-dimensional vector of zeros, and after some excursion, it visits $\mathbf{0}$ again for the first time after $t = 0$. This random stopping time of the excursion is denoted by τ. If the stopping time τ does not exist (i.e. the system never returns to original point $\mathbf{0}$), τ is assumed to take infinite value.

Vectors and their components are denoted as follows: $\mathbf{n} = \left(n^{(1)}, n^{(2)}, \ldots, n^{(d)}\right)$, $\mathbf{n}_i = \left(n_i^{(1)}, n_i^{(2)}, \ldots, n_i^{(d)}\right)$, $\mathbf{S}_t = \left(S_t^{(1)}, S_t^{(2)}, \ldots, S_t^{(d)}\right)$ and so on, by using bold Latin (lower case or capital) letters for vectors and the corresponding indexed

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 60G50; 60J80; 60C05; 60K25.

Key words and phrases. Pólya random walks; level- and state-crossings; undirected state-crossings; up- and down-directed state crossings; birth-and-death processes; Markovian single-server queues; Markov fields.

letters (with the upper index for the order number) for the components. The words *vector* and *state* are used interchangeably.

The Pólya random walks in $\mathbb{Z}^d$ are defined as follows. The vector $\mathbf{S}_t = \left(S_t^{(1)}, S_t^{(2)}, \ldots, S_t^{(d)}\right)$ denotes the state of the random walk at time t and is defined recurrently as follows:

$$\mathbf{S}_0 = \mathbf{0}, \tag{1.1}$$

$$\mathbf{S}_t = \mathbf{S}_{t-1} + \mathbf{e}_t(\mathbb{Z}^d), \quad t \geq 1, \tag{1.2}$$

where the random vector $\mathbf{e}_t(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ is in turn defined as follows. Let $\mathbf{1}_i$ denote the vector, the ith component of which is 1, and the rest components are 0. Then, the vector $\mathbf{e}_t(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ is one of the $2d$ vectors $\{\pm\mathbf{1}_i, i = 1, 2, \ldots, d\}$ that is randomly chosen with probability $1/(2d)$ independently of the other vectors and the history of the random walk.

The notation $\mathbf{e}_t(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ looks unusual. Its meaning, however, will be clear later. For differently defined random walks in this paper, the vector $\mathbf{e}_t(\bullet)$ will be defined accordingly, where in the place of symbol $\bullet$, the notation of a space will be used. For instance, $\mathbf{e}_t(\mathbb{Z}_+^d)$, $\mathbf{e}_t([-N, N]^d)$ and $\mathbf{e}_t([0, N]^d)$ may be different possible notation.

Although the concept of level-crossings is widely known and very familiar in probability theory, we could not find any paper that studies the probability distributions of state- or level-crossings for random walks, except some elementary studies in textbooks that discuss very simple problems on the level-crossings in the one-dimensional case.

Some studies of level-crossings in the literature concerns mostly the general one-dimensional random walks that are defined recurrently as $S_0 = 0$ and $S_t = S_{t-1} + X_t$, $t \geq 1$, where $X_1, X_2, \ldots$ is the sequence of independently and identically distributed random variables. However, the papers in this area are chiefly related to different types of asymptotic analysis when a curved boundary is far from the origin, and they have no direct relation to our study.

The mission of the present paper is to provide an important and comprehensive study for difficult problems including derivation of the conditional probability distributions of state-crossings and sets of state crossings, given that the random interval $[0, \tau]$ is finite.

From the textbook literature, one can mention the book by Szekély [7]. Szekély [7] pointed out without the proof the following remarkable property of level-crossings of the one-dimensional random walk.

(i) Suppose that the random walk starts at 0 and, after some excursion, at the first time returns to zero again. *Then for any level i ($i \neq 0$), the expected number of crossings level i is the same for all i and equal to* 1.

According to the title of [7], this property can be specified as a paradox in probability theory. The proof of this level-crossing property can be found in the book by Wolff [10] on p. 411 as a part of the more general results of his theory but not related to the present study. The natural question that arises on the basis of this paradox is *whether or not the similar property is true for random walks of higher dimensions?* One of the most important results of the present paper is that the aforementioned result *holds true for Pólya random walks*. As well, the paper addresses many other important questions related to Pólya random walks.

Markovian queueing models are analogs of random walks. For instance, the $M/M/1$ and $M/M/1/n$ queueing systems with equal arrival and service rates can be thought as random processes, the jump trajectories of which coincide with some parts of the paths of the one-dimensional random walk. More specifically, the aforementioned result on level-crossings of the one-dimensional random walk can be reformulated in queueing terminology as follows.

(ii) *If the expectations of interarrival and service times are equal, then the expected number of losses during a busy period in the $M/M/1/n$ queueing system is equal to 1 for any n.*

The relation between claims (i) and (ii) is not evident. While claim (i) is defined for the random walk in $\mathbb{Z}^1$, other claim (ii) is related to the reflected random walk that is defined on the series of space intervals $[0, n]$ with different n. Moreover, in (i) it is spoken about the random walk that started at zero and returns to zero, while in (ii) a busy period starts when there is one customer in the queue (i.e. the system is in state 1) and finishes when the system is empty (i.e the system is in state 0). The connection between claims (i) and (ii) will be understood later in the framework of the proof of the basic results.

Surprisingly, claim (ii) remains true for the $M/GI/1/n$ queueing system and admits further extensions. For review of the relevant results see Abramov [2], [3]. The series of the results on the properties of losses in queueing systems are culminated by the proof of the characterization theorem in Abramov [4], where the necessary and sufficient conditions are established for the claim that the expected number of losses in a busy period are a same constant for all n, for a wide class of $GI^X/GI^Y/1/n$ queueing systems.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we provide necessary notation, definitions, remarks and examples. In Section 3 we introduce the stochastic objects that are then used in the formulations and proofs of the basic results. In Section 4, we formulate the basic results of this work. They are related to the study of crossings the states and sets of states for specially defined undirected and up- and down-directed states (or sets of states) crossings. In Sections 5, 6, 7 and 8, the proofs of the basic theorems and corollary are provided. In Section 9, some results for A-crossings are proved. In Section 10 we summarize the results of the paper.

2. Notation, definitions, remarks and examples

The following notation is used in the paper. For any vector $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, its l_1-norm is

$$\|\mathbf{n}\| = \sum_{i=1}^{d} \left|n^{(i)}\right|.$$

Let $\mathcal{Z} = \{\mathbf{n}_1, \mathbf{n}_2, \ldots, \mathbf{n}_l\} \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$. If the vectors $\mathbf{n}_1, \mathbf{n}_2, \ldots, \mathbf{n}_l$ all have the same norm n, then we write $\|\mathcal{Z}\| = n$. In this case the set $\mathcal{Z}$ is called *normed set*.

The vector $|\mathbf{n}| = \left(|n^{(1)}, |n^{(2)}|, \ldots, |n^{(d)}|\right)$ is called *non-negative version* or *module* of the vector $\mathbf{n}$, and with $0/0 = 1$,

$$\mathsf{sign}(\mathbf{n}) = \left(\frac{n^{(1)}}{|n^{(1)}|}, \frac{n^{(2)}}{|n^{(2)}|}, \ldots, \frac{n^{(d)}}{|n^{(d)}|}\right)$$

is called the *sign vector* of the vector $\mathbf{n}$. Let $\psi : \mathbb{Z}^d \to \mathbb{Z}_+^d$ be the operator reflecting any vector $\mathbf{n}$ into $|\mathbf{n}|$. The inverse operator of ψ from the space $\mathbb{Z}_+^d$ to the space $\mathbb{Z}^d$ is not defined. Hence, by inverse operator we mean $\psi^{-1} : \mathbb{Z}_+^d \times \{-1, +1\}^d \to \mathbb{Z}^d$. Thus defined, the inverse operator inverts uniquely a couple of vectors $(|\mathbf{n}|, \mathsf{sign}(\mathbf{n}))$ into $\mathbf{n}$.

An important example of a normed set $\mathcal{Z}$ is the set

$$\mathcal{X}(\mathbf{n}) = \{\mathbf{m} : \mathbf{m} = |\mathbf{n}|\}.$$

For instance, $\mathcal{X}((1,2)) = \{(1,2), (-1,2), (1,-2), (-1,-2)\}$.

Other important examples of a normed set $\mathcal{Z}$ are the set of all vectors in $\mathbb{Z}^d$ with norm n and the set of all vectors in $\mathbb{Z}_+^d$ with norm n. These sets are denoted $\mathcal{N}(n)$ and $\mathcal{N}^+(n)$, respectively.

Writing $\mathbf{n} \geq \mathbf{m}$ means that $n^{(i)} \geq m^{(i)}$ for all $i = 1, 2, \ldots, d$, e.g $\mathbf{n} \geq \mathbf{1}$ means $n^{(i)} \geq 1$, $i = 1, 2, \ldots, d$; $\mathbf{n} \neq \mathbf{0}$ means at least one of $n^{(i)}$, $i = 1, 2, \ldots, d$, is other than 0.

Let $\mathbf{n} = \left(n^{(1)}, n^{(2)}, \ldots, n^{(d)}\right) \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ be a d-dimensional vector. The number of zero components of this vector is denoted by $d_0(\mathbf{n})$ and the number of unit components by $d_1(\mathbf{n})$. For example, the vector $(0, 1, 0, 0, 1, 5)$ has 3 zero components and 2 unit components. Nonzero components will be called *meaningful components* or briefly *m-components*. Then, the number of m-components of the vector $\mathbf{n}$ is $d - d_0(\mathbf{n})$.

Definition 2.1. Let $\mathcal{Z} \subset \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$. The random variable $f(\mathcal{Z})$ is called *the number of crossings* $\mathcal{Z}$, if there exist the time instants $0 < t_1(\mathcal{Z}) < t_2(\mathcal{Z}) < \ldots < t_{f(\mathcal{Z})}(\mathcal{Z}) < \tau$ such that $\mathbf{S}_{t_i(\mathcal{Z})} \in \mathcal{Z}$, $i = 1, 2, \ldots, f(\mathcal{Z})$. If the set $\mathcal{Z}$ contains only a single element $\mathbf{n}$, then the notation $f(\mathbf{n})$ is used, and $f(\mathbf{n})$ is called *the number of state-crossings* $\mathbf{n}$.

Definition 2.2. For a normed set $\mathcal{Z} \subset \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$, the random variable $\overrightarrow{f}(\mathcal{Z})$ is called the number of *up-directed* crossings $\mathcal{Z}$, if there exist the time instants $0 < t_1(\mathcal{Z}) < t_2(\mathcal{Z}) < \ldots < t_{\overrightarrow{f}(\mathcal{Z})}(\mathcal{Z}) < \tau$ such that $\mathbf{S}_{t_i(\mathbf{n})} \in \mathcal{Z}$ and $\|\mathbf{S}_{t_i(\mathcal{Z})-1}\| = \|\mathcal{Z}\| - 1$, $i = 1, 2, \ldots, \overrightarrow{f}(\mathcal{Z})$. If the set $\mathcal{Z}$ contains only a single element $\mathbf{n}$, then the notation $\overrightarrow{f}(\mathbf{n})$ is used, and $\overrightarrow{f}(\mathbf{n})$ is called *the number of up-directed state-crossings* $\mathbf{n}$.

Definition 2.3. For any normed set $\mathcal{Z} \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$, the random variable $\overleftarrow{f}(\mathcal{Z})$ is called the number of *down-directed* crossings the set $\mathcal{Z}$, if there exist the time instants $0 < t_1(\mathcal{Z}) < t_2(\mathcal{Z}) < \ldots < t_{\overleftarrow{f}(\mathcal{Z})}(\mathcal{Z}) < \tau$ such that $\mathbf{S}_{t_i(\mathcal{Z})} \in \mathcal{Z}$ and $\|\mathbf{S}_{t_i(\mathcal{Z})-1}\| = \|\mathcal{Z}\| + 1$, $i = 1, 2, \ldots, \overleftarrow{f}(\mathcal{Z})$. If the set $\mathcal{Z}$ contains only a single element $\mathbf{n}$, then the notation $\overleftarrow{f}(\mathbf{n})$ is used, and $\overleftarrow{f}(\mathbf{n})$ is called *the number of down-directed state-crossings* $\mathbf{n}$.

Remark 2.4. Unlike Definitions 2.1 and 2.2, Definition 2.3 implies that $\mathcal{Z}$ can be equal to $\{\mathbf{0}\}$, and $\overleftarrow{f}(\mathbf{0})$ is defined.

Remark 2.5. For one-dimensional random walk in $\mathbb{Z}^1$ we use the scalar notation. The random walk is denoted by S_t and the numbers of state-crossings (or, more exactly, level-crossings) are denoted by $f(n)$, $\overrightarrow{f}(n)$ or $\overleftarrow{f}(n)$ for the cases of undirected, up-directed and down-directed level-crossings, respectively.

Definition 2.6. Let $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$. The set of the vectors

$$\mathcal{M}^-(\mathbf{n}) = \{\psi^{-1}(\mathbf{m}, \mathsf{sign}(\mathbf{n})) \ : \ \mathbf{m} = \psi(\mathbf{n}) - \mathbf{1}_i, \\ \|\mathbf{m}\| = \|\mathbf{n}\| - 1, \ i = 1, 2, \ldots, d\}$$

is called the *lower set* for the vector $\mathbf{n}$, and the set of the vectors

$$\mathcal{M}^+(\mathbf{n}) = \{\psi^{-1}(\mathbf{m}, \mathsf{sign}(\mathbf{n} \pm \mathbf{1}_i)) \ : \ \mathbf{m} = \psi(\mathbf{n}) + \mathbf{1}_i, \\ \|\mathbf{m}\| = \|\mathbf{n}\| + 1, \ i = 1, 2, \ldots, d\}$$

is called the *upper set* for the vector $\mathbf{n}$. The vectors (states) belonging to $\mathcal{M}^-(\mathbf{n})$ or $\mathcal{M}^+(\mathbf{n})$ are the neighbor vectors with respect to the vector $\mathbf{n}$ from the two different directions.

Remark 2.7. The argument $\mathsf{sign}(\mathbf{n})$ of the function $\psi^{-1}(\mathbf{m}, \mathsf{sign}(\mathbf{n}))$ serves for implementing the vectors of the set $\mathcal{M}^-(\mathbf{n})$. The components of these vectors must have the same sign as the original vector $\mathbf{n}$. When $n^{(i)} = 1$, the ith component of the vector obtained after the inversion is zero, which, according to the convention above, has the positive sign. However, in the case of $n^{(i)} = -1$, the sign of the ith element, which is zero as well, is negative. This situation will not be considered as confusing since the sign of zero does not matter. (In Example 2.11, we write the negative zero element for the first vector in the set of (2.1) as a correct result of the inversion.)

Remark 2.8. The argument $\mathsf{sign}(\mathbf{n} \pm \mathbf{1}_i)$ of the function $\psi^{-1}(\mathbf{m}, \mathsf{sign}(\mathbf{n} \pm \mathbf{1}_i))$ serves for implementing the elements of the set $\mathcal{M}^+(\mathbf{n})$ as follows. When a component $n^{(i)}$ is strictly positive or negative, then the vectors $\mathsf{sign}(\mathbf{n} \pm \mathbf{1}_i)$ and $\mathsf{sign}(\mathbf{n})$ are to be the same. That is, for $n^{(i)}$ positive we take $\mathsf{sign}(\mathbf{n} + \mathbf{1}_i)$ since $\|\mathbf{n} + \mathbf{1}_i\| = \|\mathbf{n}\| + 1$ while $\|\mathbf{n} - \mathbf{1}_i\| \neq \|\mathbf{n}\| + 1$, and for $n^{(i)}$ negative we take $\mathsf{sign}(\mathbf{n} - \mathbf{1}_i)$ since $\|\mathbf{n} - \mathbf{1}_i\| = \|\mathbf{n}\| + 1$ while $\|\mathbf{n} + \mathbf{1}_i\| \neq \|\mathbf{n}\| + 1$. However, if $n^{(i)} = 0$, then the vectors $\mathsf{sign}(\mathbf{n} - \mathbf{1}_i)$ and $\mathsf{sign}(\mathbf{n} + \mathbf{1}_i)$ are distinct and their norms both are $\|\mathbf{n}\| + 1$. In this case, both of the vectors $\psi^{-1}(\mathbf{m}, \mathsf{sign}(\mathbf{n} + \mathbf{1}_i))$ and $\psi^{-1}(\mathbf{m}, \mathsf{sign}(\mathbf{n} - \mathbf{1}_i))$ must be included into the set.

Remark 2.9. The total number of vectors in the set $\mathcal{M}^+(\mathbf{n}) \cup \mathcal{M}^-(\mathbf{n})$ is the same for all $\mathbf{n}$ and equal to $2d$. The total number of vectors in the sets $\mathcal{M}^-(\mathbf{n})$ and $\mathcal{M}^+(\mathbf{n})$ are $d - d_0(\mathbf{n})$ and $d + d_0(\mathbf{n})$, respectively.

Example 2.10. For the vector $(-2, 3) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$, the lower set of the vectors is

$$\{(-1, 3), (-2, 2)\}$$

and the upper set of the vectors is

$$\{(-3, 3), (-2, 4)\}.$$

Example 2.11. For the vector $(-1, 0, 1) \in \mathbb{Z}^3$, the lower set of the vectors is

$$\{(-0, 0, 1), (-1, 0, 0)\} \tag{2.1}$$

and the upper set of the vectors is

$$\{(-2, 0, 1), (-1, 1, 1), (-1, -1, 1), (-1, 0, 2)\}.$$

Definition 2.12. Let $\mathcal{M}^+(\mathbf{n})$ be the upper set of the vector $\mathbf{n}$, and let $\mathbf{m}_1$, $\mathbf{m}_2$,...,$\mathbf{m}_k$ be the elements of this set, where $k = d + d_0(\mathbf{n})$ is the number of its elements. The new set containing the elements $|\mathbf{m}_1|$, $|\mathbf{m}_2|$,...,$|\mathbf{m}_k|$ is denoted $|\mathcal{M}^+(\mathbf{n})|$.

Example 2.13. For the vector $(-1,0,1) \in \mathbb{Z}^3$ defined in Example 2.11,

$$|\mathcal{M}^+((-1,0,1))| = \{(2,0,1),(1,1,1),(1,0,2)\}.$$

Notice that while the set $\mathcal{M}^+((-1,0,1))$ contains 4 elements (see Example 2.11), the number of elements in the set $|\mathcal{M}^+((-1,0,1))|$ is only 3. This is because $|(-1,1,1)| = |(-1,-1,1)| = (1,1,1)$. In this case, we say that the range of element $(1,1,1) \in |\mathcal{M}^+((-1,0,1))|$ is 2.

Below, the general definition of the range of elements in $|\mathcal{M}^+(\mathbf{n})|$, $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$, is provided.

Definition 2.14. We say that the element $\mathbf{m} \in |\mathcal{M}^+(\mathbf{n})|$ has range 2 if there are two distinct elements in $\mathcal{M}^+(\mathbf{n})$ denoted by $\mathbf{m}_1$ and $\mathbf{m}_2$ such that $|\mathbf{m}_1| = |\mathbf{m}_2| = \mathbf{m}$. If the set $\mathcal{M}^+(\mathbf{n})$ contains only a single element $\mathbf{m}_1$ such that $|\mathbf{m}_1| = \mathbf{m}$, then the range of element $\mathbf{m}$ is 1. The range of element $\mathbf{m}$ will be denoted by $r(\mathbf{m})$.

Remark 2.15. The number of elements in $|\mathcal{M}^+(\mathbf{n})|$ having range 2 coincides with $d_0(\mathbf{n})$, the number of zeros in the presentation of vector $\mathbf{n}$. Hence, the total number of elements in $|\mathcal{M}^+(\mathbf{n})|$ is d.

Definition 2.16. Let A be a nonempty set, and $A \subseteq \mathcal{M}^-(\mathbf{n}) \cup \mathcal{M}^+(\mathbf{n})$. The random variable $f_A(\mathbf{n})$ is called A-directed number of state-crossings of the state $\mathbf{n}$, if there exist time instants $0 < t_1(\mathbf{n}) < t_2(\mathbf{n}) < \ldots < t_{f_A(\mathbf{n})}(\mathbf{n}) < \tau$ such that $\mathbf{S}_{t_i(\mathbf{n})} = \mathbf{n}$ and $\mathbf{S}_{t_i(\mathbf{n})-1} \in A$, $i = 1,2,\ldots,f_A(\mathbf{n})$.

Remark 2.17. Note, that if the sets A and $\mathcal{M}^-(\mathbf{n}) \cup \mathcal{M}^+(\mathbf{n})$ coincide, then the definition of $f_A(\mathbf{n})$ and $f(\mathbf{n})$ is the same, that is, $f_A(\mathbf{n}) = f(\mathbf{n})$.

The other two obvious cases are as follows.

If the set A coincides with the set $\mathcal{M}^-(\mathbf{n})$, then $f_A(\mathbf{n}) = \overrightarrow{f}(\mathbf{n})$.

If the set A coincides with the set $\mathcal{M}^+(\mathbf{n})$, then $f_A(\mathbf{n}) = \overleftarrow{f}(\mathbf{n})$.

Remark 2.18. In general, the set A can be represented as $A = A^+ \cup A^-$, where $A^+ \subseteq \mathcal{M}^+(\mathbf{n})$ and $A^- \subseteq \mathcal{M}^-(\mathbf{n})$.

3. Markov fields and processes

3.1. **The Markov field $P_{\mathbf{n}}$.** The random field $P_{\mathbf{n}}$, $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, is defined as follows. For any set $\mathcal{Z} \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$ denote by $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Z})$ the filtration of the set $\{P_{\mathbf{m}} : \mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{Z}\}$. Then, with fixed $P_{\mathbf{0}} = 1$ for any $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$, and all $k = 0,1,\ldots,$ the Markov property

$$\mathsf{P}\{P_{\mathbf{n}} = k \mid \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{\mathbf{n}\})\} = \mathsf{P}\{P_{\mathbf{n}} = k \mid \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{M}^-(\mathbf{n}) \cup \mathcal{M}^+(\mathbf{n}))\}$$

is assumed to be satisfied and hence, the field $P_{\mathbf{n}}$ is Markov. (Recall that the set $\mathcal{M}^-(\mathbf{n}) \cup \mathcal{M}^+(\mathbf{n})$ is the set of all neighbor elements of the vector $\mathbf{n}$.) Denote by $p(\mathbf{m},\mathbf{n})$ the number of immediate (one-step) transitions from state $\mathbf{m}$ to state $\mathbf{n}$. Then

$$P_{\mathbf{n}} = \sum_{\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{M}^-(\mathbf{n}) \cup \mathcal{M}^+(\mathbf{n})} p(\mathbf{m},\mathbf{n}),$$

and the meaning of $P_{\mathbf{n}}$ is the total number of transitions to state $\mathbf{n}$.

Apparently, the set $\{P_{\mathbf{n}}\}$ for all $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ uniquely defines the set $\{p(\mathbf{m},\mathbf{n})\}$ for all $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ and $\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{M}^-(\mathbf{n}) \cup \mathcal{M}^+(\mathbf{n})$ and vice versa.

Let $\|\mathbf{n}\| \geq 2$. For $\mathbf{m}^* \in \mathcal{M}^-(\mathbf{n})$ denote

$$\pi^-(\mathbf{m}^*) = \sum_{\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{M}^-(\mathbf{m}^*)} p(\mathbf{m},\mathbf{m}^*),$$

and for $\mathbf{m}^* \in \mathcal{M}^+(\mathbf{n})$ denote

$$\pi^+(\mathbf{m}^*) = \sum_{\mathbf{m}\in\mathcal{M}^+(\mathbf{m}^*)} p(\mathbf{m},\mathbf{m}^*),$$

so $\pi^-(\mathbf{m}^*) + \pi^+(\mathbf{m}^*) = P_{\mathbf{m}^*}$.

The following properties are assumed to be satisfied. For all $k = 0, 1, \ldots,$

$$\mathsf{P}\left\{p(\mathbf{m}^*,\mathbf{n}) = k \mid \pi^-(\mathbf{m}^*) = 1\right\} = \frac{d - d_0(\mathbf{n})}{d - d_0(\mathbf{n}) + 1}\left(\frac{1}{d - d_0(\mathbf{n}) + 1}\right)^k,$$

$$\mathsf{P}\left\{p(\mathbf{m}^*,\mathbf{n}) = k \mid \pi^+(\mathbf{m}^*) = 1\right\} = \frac{d + d_0(\mathbf{n})}{d + d_0(\mathbf{n}) + 1}\left(\frac{1}{d + d_0(\mathbf{n}) + 1}\right)^k,$$

and for $m \geq 2$ we, respectively, have

$$\mathsf{P}\{p(\mathbf{m}^*,\mathbf{n}) = k \mid \pi^-(\mathbf{m}^*) = m\} = \sum_{l=0}^{k} \mathsf{P}\left\{p(\mathbf{m}^*,\mathbf{n}) = l \mid \pi^-(\mathbf{m}^*) = 1\right\} \times \mathsf{P}\left\{p(\mathbf{m}^*,\mathbf{n}) = k - l \mid \pi^-(\mathbf{m}^*) = m - 1\right\},$$

and

$$\mathsf{P}\{p(\mathbf{m}^*,\mathbf{n}) = k \mid \pi^+(\mathbf{m}^*) = m\} = \sum_{l=0}^{k} \mathsf{P}\left\{p(\mathbf{m}^*,\mathbf{n}) = l \mid \pi^+(\mathbf{m}^*) = 1\right\} \times \mathsf{P}\left\{p(\mathbf{m}^*,\mathbf{n}) = k - l \mid \pi^+(\mathbf{m}^*) = m - 1\right\}.$$

The boundary conditions for the Markov field $P_{\mathbf{n}}$ are $P_{\mathbf{0}} = 1$ and for all $i = 1, 2, \ldots, d$

$$\mathsf{P}\{p(\mathbf{0},\mathbf{1}_i) = 1\} = \mathsf{P}\{p(\mathbf{0},-\mathbf{1}_i) = 1\} = \frac{1}{2d},$$

and

$$\mathsf{P}\{p(\mathbf{1}_i,\mathbf{0}) = 1\} = \mathsf{P}\{p(-\mathbf{1}_i,\mathbf{0}) = 1\} = \frac{1}{2d},$$

as well as

$$\sum_{i=1}^{d} p(\mathbf{0},\mathbf{1}_i) + \sum_{i=1}^{d} p(\mathbf{0},-\mathbf{1}_i) = 1,$$

and

$$\sum_{i=1}^{d} p(\mathbf{1}_i,\mathbf{0}) + \sum_{i=1}^{d} p(-\mathbf{1},\mathbf{0}) = 1.$$

3.2. **The Markov field $Q_{\mathbf{n}}$.** The random field $Q_{\mathbf{n}}$, $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^d$, is defined similarly to the random field $P_{\mathbf{n}}$. Let $\mathcal{Z} \subset \mathbb{Z}_+^d$ and let $\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{Z})$ be the filtration of the set $\{Q_{\mathbf{m}} : \mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{Z}\}$. Then, with $Q_{\mathbf{0}} = 1$ for any $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^d \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$, and all $k = 0, 1, \ldots,$ the Markov property

$$\mathsf{P}\{Q_{\mathbf{n}} = k \mid \mathcal{Q}(\mathbb{Z}_+^d \setminus \{\mathbf{n}\})\} = \mathsf{P}\{Q_{\mathbf{n}} = k \mid \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{M}^-(\mathbf{n}) \cup |\mathcal{M}^+(\mathbf{n})|)\}$$

is satisfied. Note, that the set $\mathcal{M}^-(\mathbf{n}) \cup |\mathcal{M}^+(\mathbf{n})|$ is the set of the neighbor elements of vector $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^d \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$, and hence the field $Q_{\mathbf{n}}$ is Markov. Let $q(\mathbf{m},\mathbf{n})$ be the number of immediate (one-step) transitions from state $\mathbf{m}$ to state $\mathbf{n}$. Then

$$Q_{\mathbf{n}} = \sum_{\mathbf{m}\in\mathcal{M}^-(\mathbf{n})\cup|\mathcal{M}^+(\mathbf{n})|} q(\mathbf{m},\mathbf{n}),$$

and the meaning of $Q_{\mathbf{n}}$ is the total number of transitions to state $\mathbf{n}$.

Similarly to the aforementioned property of the Markov field $P_{\mathbf{n}}$, the set $\{Q_{\mathbf{n}}\}$ for all $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{Z}_{+}^{d}$ uniquely defines the set $\{q(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n})\}$ for all $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{Z}_{+}^{d}$ and $\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{M}^{-}(\mathbf{n}) \cup |\mathcal{M}^{+}(\mathbf{n})|$ and vice versa.

Let $\|\mathbf{n}\| \geq 2$. For $\mathbf{m}^{*} \in \mathcal{M}^{-}(\mathbf{n})$ denote

$$\kappa^{-}(\mathbf{m}^{*}) = \sum_{\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{M}^{-}(\mathbf{m}^{*})} q(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{m}^{*}),$$

and for $\mathbf{m}^{*} \in |\mathcal{M}^{+}(\mathbf{n})|$ denote

$$\kappa^{+}(\mathbf{m}^{*}) = \sum_{\mathbf{m} \in |\mathcal{M}^{+}(\mathbf{m}^{*})|} q(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{m}^{*}),$$

so $\kappa^{-}(\mathbf{m}^{*}) + \kappa^{+}(\mathbf{m}^{*}) = Q_{\mathbf{m}^{*}}$.

The following properties are assumed to be satisfied. For the conditional probability $\mathsf{P}\left\{q(\mathbf{m}^{*}, \mathbf{n}) = k \mid \kappa^{-}(\mathbf{m}^{*}) = 1\right\}$ we have

$$\mathsf{P}\left\{q(\mathbf{m}^{*}, \mathbf{n}) = k \mid \kappa^{-}(\mathbf{m}^{*}) = 1\right\} = \frac{d - d_{0}(\mathbf{n})}{d - d_{0}(\mathbf{n}) + 1} \left(\frac{1}{d - d_{0}(\mathbf{n}) + 1}\right)^{k},$$

if $\mathsf{card}[\mathcal{M}^{-}(\mathbf{m}^{*})] = \mathsf{card}[\mathcal{M}^{-}(\mathbf{n})]$ and

$$\mathsf{P}\left\{q(\mathbf{m}^{*}, \mathbf{n}) = k \mid \kappa^{-}(\mathbf{m}^{*}) = 1\right\} = \frac{d - d_{0}(\mathbf{n}) - 1}{d - d_{0}(\mathbf{n}) + 1} \left(\frac{2}{d - d_{0}(\mathbf{n}) + 1}\right)^{k},$$

if $\mathsf{card}[\mathcal{M}^{-}(\mathbf{m}^{*})] = \mathsf{card}[\mathcal{M}^{-}(\mathbf{n})] - 1$.

In turn, for the conditional probability $\mathsf{P}\left\{q(\mathbf{m}^{*}, \mathbf{n}) = k \mid \kappa^{+}(\mathbf{m}^{*}) = 1\right\}$ we have:

$$\mathsf{P}\left\{q(\mathbf{m}^{*}, \mathbf{n}) = k \mid \kappa^{+}(\mathbf{m}^{*}) = 1\right\} = \frac{d + d_{0}(\mathbf{n}) - r(\mathbf{m}^{*}) + 1}{d + d_{0}(\mathbf{n}) + 1} \left(\frac{r(\mathbf{m}^{*})}{d + d_{0}(\mathbf{n}) + 1}\right)^{k}.$$

For $m \geq 2$ and all $k = 0, 1, \ldots$ we, respectively, have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathsf{P}\{q(\mathbf{m}^{*}, \mathbf{n}) = k \mid \kappa^{-}(\mathbf{m}^{*}) = m\} = \sum_{l=0}^{k} \mathsf{P}\left\{q(\mathbf{m}^{*}, \mathbf{n}) = l \mid \kappa^{-}(\mathbf{m}^{*}) = 1\right\} \\ \times \mathsf{P}\left\{q(\mathbf{m}^{*}, \mathbf{n}) = k - l \mid \kappa^{-}(\mathbf{m}^{*}) = m - 1\right\},\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\mathsf{P}\{q(\mathbf{m}^{*}, \mathbf{n}) = k \mid \kappa^{+}(\mathbf{m}^{*}) = m\} = \sum_{l=0}^{k} \mathsf{P}\left\{q(\mathbf{m}^{*}, \mathbf{n}) = l \mid \kappa^{+}(\mathbf{m}^{*}) = 1\right\} \\ \times \mathsf{P}\left\{q(\mathbf{m}^{*}, \mathbf{n}) = k - l \mid \kappa^{+}(\mathbf{m}^{*}) = m - 1\right\}.\end{aligned}$$

The boundary conditions for the Markov field $Q_{\mathbf{n}}$ are $Q_{\mathbf{0}} = 1$ and for all $i = 1, 2, \ldots, d$

$$\mathsf{P}\{q(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{1}_{i}) = 1\} = \frac{1}{d},$$

and

$$\mathsf{P}\{q(\mathbf{1}_{i}, \mathbf{0}) = 1\} = \frac{1}{d},$$

as well as

$$\sum_{i=1}^{d} q(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{1}_{i}) = 1,$$

and

$$\sum_{i=1}^{d} q(\mathbf{1}_i, \mathbf{0}) = 1.$$

3.3. **Particular cases.** In the one-dimensional case where $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+^1$, the Markov sequence Q_n satisfies the following properties: $Q_0 = 1$, $q(0,1) = q(1,0) = 1$ and for $n \geq 1$, $m \geq 2$ and $k = 0, 1, \ldots$

$$\mathsf{P}\{q(n, n+1) = k \mid q(n-1, n) = 1\} = \frac{1}{2^{k+1}},$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathsf{P}\{q(n, n+1) = k \mid q(n-1, n) = m\}\\ &= \sum_{l=0}^{k} \mathsf{P}\{q(n, n+1) = l \mid q(n-1, n) = 1\}\\ &\times \mathsf{P}\{q(n, n+1) = k - l \mid q(n-1, n) = m-1\}.\end{aligned}$$

In addition, with probability 1, $q(n, n+1) = q(n+1, n)$.

That is, the distribution of $q(n, n+1)$ and $q(n+1, n)$ coincide with the distribution of the number of offspring in the nth generation of the Galton-Watson branching process Z_n with $Z_0 = 1$ and the offspring distribution $\mathsf{P}\{Z_1 = k\} = 1/2^{k+1}$. Since,

$$Q_n = q(n-1, n) + q(n+1, n) = q(n-1, n) + q(n, n+1), \quad n \geq 1,$$

then Q_n coincides in distribution with $Z_{n-1} + Z_n$. In turn, for P_n, $n \neq 0$, we have as follows. Since P_n and P_{-n} have the same distribution, then the distribution of P_n for all $k = 1, 2, \ldots$ is specified by the relation

$$\mathsf{P}\{P_n = k\} = \frac{1}{2}\mathsf{P}\{Z_{|n|-1} + Z_{|n|} = k\},$$

and $\mathsf{P}\{P_n = 0\}$ is defined from the normalization condition.

3.4. **The Markov process R_n.** Discrete time Markov process R_n, $n \geq 0$ is a nonnegative integer-valued Markov chain satisfying the following properties: $R_0 = 1$,

$$\mathsf{P}\{R_{n+1} = k | R_n = 1\} = \frac{C(n)}{2C(n) + C_0(n)} \left(\frac{C(n) + C_0(n)}{2C(n) + C_0(n)}\right)^k,$$

where

$$C(n) = \sum_{i=1}^{d} i 2^i \binom{d}{i} \binom{n-1}{i-1}, \; C_0(n) = \sum_{i=1}^{d-1} (d-i) 2^{i+1} \binom{d}{i} \binom{n-1}{i-1},$$

and for $m \geq 2$

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathsf{P}\{R_{n+1} = k | R_n = m\}\\ &= \sum_{l=0}^{k} \mathsf{P}\{R_{n+1} = l | R_n = 1\} \mathsf{P}\{R_{n+1} = k - l | R_n = m-1\}.\end{aligned}$$

Here and in the sequel, $\binom{0}{0} = 1$ and $\binom{n}{k}$ is set to zero if $n < k$.

The quantities $C(n)$ and $C_0(n)$ are characterized as follows. The total number of vectors in $\mathbb{Z}^d$ with norm n is

$$\sum_{i=1}^{d} 2^i \binom{d}{i} \binom{n-1}{i-1} = \frac{1}{2d}[C_0(n) + 2C(n)].$$

So, the meaning of $\frac{1}{2}C_0(n)$ is the total number of zero elements in all the vectors having norm n, and $C(n)$ is the total number of nonzero elements in all the vectors having same norm n.

For $d = 1$, we have $C_0(n) = 0$, and the process R_n reduces to the Galton-Watson branching process Z_n with $Z_0 = 1$ and the offspring distribution $\mathsf{P}\{Z_1 = k\} = 1/2^{k+1}$.

4. The basic results

The basic results of the paper are specified as follows. Theorem 4.1 is the theorem on the conditional distribution of the number of crossings the set $\mathcal{N}(n)$. Theorem 4.3 is the theorem on the conditional distributions of the number of crossings the sets $\mathcal{X}(\mathbf{n})$. Theorem 4.5 is the theorem on the conditional distributions of the number of state-crossings. Corollary 4.6 describes the level-crossings of the one-dimensional random walk. Theorem 4.7 describes the conditional expectations of crossings the sets of states $\mathcal{X}(\mathbf{n})$ and states $\mathbf{n}$. Specifically, relation (4.20) of the theorem contains the important claim that the conditional expectation of the number of crossings any state $\mathbf{n} \neq \mathbf{0}$ given the random walks returns to the origin is equal to 1.

Theorem 4.1. *For any integer $n \geq 1$ and all $k = 0, 1, \ldots$,*

$$\mathsf{P}\left\{\overrightarrow{f}[\mathcal{N}(n)] = k \mid \tau < \infty\right\} = \mathsf{P}\left\{R_{n-1} = k\right\}, \tag{4.1}$$

$$\mathsf{P}\left\{\overleftarrow{f}[\mathcal{N}(n)] = k \mid \tau < \infty\right\} = \mathsf{P}\left\{R_{n} = k\right\}, \tag{4.2}$$

$$\mathsf{P}\{f[\mathcal{N}(n)] = k \mid \tau < \infty\} = \mathsf{P}\left\{R_{n-1} + R_n = k\right\}. \tag{4.3}$$

Remark 4.2. Relation (4.2) is defined for $n = 0$ as well. Specifically,

$$\mathsf{P}\left\{\overleftarrow{f}[\mathcal{N}(0)] = 1 \mid \tau < \infty\right\} = \mathsf{P}\left\{\overrightarrow{f}[\mathcal{N}(1)] = 1 \mid \tau < \infty\right\} = 1.$$

Theorem 4.3. *For any $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^d \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$ and all $k = 0, 1, \ldots,$*

$$\mathsf{P}\left\{\overrightarrow{f}[\mathcal{X}(\mathbf{n})] = k \mid \tau < \infty\right\} = \mathsf{P}\left\{\sum_{\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{M}^-(\mathbf{n})} q(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n}) = k\right\}, \tag{4.4}$$

$$\mathsf{P}\left\{\overleftarrow{f}[\mathcal{X}(\mathbf{n})] = k \mid \tau < \infty\right\} = \mathsf{P}\left\{\sum_{\mathbf{m} \in |\mathcal{M}^+(\mathbf{n})|} q(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n}) = k\right\}, \tag{4.5}$$

and

$$\mathsf{P}\{f[\mathcal{X}(\mathbf{n})] = k \mid \tau < \infty\} = \mathsf{P}\{Q_{\mathbf{n}} = k\}. \tag{4.6}$$

Furthermore, for conditional distributions of $\overrightarrow{f}[\mathcal{X}(\mathbf{n})]$ *and* $\overleftarrow{f}[\mathcal{X}(\mathbf{n})]$ *we have the recurrence relations* ($k = 0, 1, \ldots; m \geq 2$)*:*

$$\mathsf{P}\left\{\overrightarrow{f}[\mathcal{X}(\mathbf{n})] = k \mid \sum_{\mathbf{m}\in\mathcal{M}^-(\mathbf{n})} \overrightarrow{f}[\mathcal{X}(\mathbf{m})] = 1, \tau < \infty\right\}$$

$$= \frac{2[d - d_0(\mathbf{n}) - d_1(\mathbf{n})]}{2[d - d_0(\mathbf{n})] - d_1(\mathbf{n})} \cdot \frac{d - d_0(\mathbf{n})}{d - d_0(\mathbf{n}) + 1} \left(\frac{1}{d - d_0(\mathbf{n}) + 1}\right)^k \tag{4.7}$$

$$+ \frac{d_1(\mathbf{n})}{2[d - d_0(\mathbf{n})] - d_1(\mathbf{n})} \cdot \frac{d - d_0(\mathbf{n}) - 1}{d - d_0(\mathbf{n}) + 1} \left(\frac{2}{d - d_0(\mathbf{n}) + 1}\right)^k,$$

$$\mathsf{P}\left\{\overrightarrow{f}[\mathcal{X}(\mathbf{n})] = k \mid \sum_{\mathbf{m}\in\mathcal{M}^-(\mathbf{n})} \overrightarrow{f}[\mathcal{X}(\mathbf{m})] = m, \tau < \infty\right\}$$

$$= \sum_{l=0}^{k} \mathsf{P}\left\{\overrightarrow{f}[\mathcal{X}(\mathbf{n})] = l \mid \sum_{\mathbf{m}\in\mathcal{M}^-(\mathbf{n})} \overrightarrow{f}[\mathcal{X}(\mathbf{m})] = m - 1, \tau < \infty\right\} \tag{4.8}$$

$$\times \mathsf{P}\left\{\overrightarrow{f}[\mathcal{X}(\mathbf{n})] = k - l \mid \sum_{\mathbf{m}\in\mathcal{M}^-(\mathbf{n})} \overrightarrow{f}[\mathcal{X}(\mathbf{m})] = 1, \tau < \infty\right\},$$

$$\mathsf{P}\left\{\overleftarrow{f}[\mathcal{X}(\mathbf{n})] = k \mid \sum_{\mathbf{m}\in|\mathcal{M}^+(\mathbf{n})|} \overleftarrow{f}[\mathcal{X}(\mathbf{m})] = 1, \tau < \infty\right\}$$

$$= \frac{2d_0(\mathbf{n})}{d + d_0(\mathbf{n})} \cdot \frac{d + d_0(\mathbf{n}) - 1}{d + d_0(\mathbf{n}) + 1} \left(\frac{2}{d + d_0(\mathbf{n}) + 1}\right)^k \tag{4.9}$$

$$+ \frac{d - d_0(\mathbf{n})}{d + d_0(\mathbf{n})} \cdot \frac{d + d_0(\mathbf{n})}{d + d_0(\mathbf{n}) + 1} \left(\frac{1}{d + d_0(\mathbf{n}) + 1}\right)^k,$$

$$\mathsf{P}\left\{\overleftarrow{f}[\mathcal{X}(\mathbf{n})] = k \mid \sum_{\mathbf{m}\in|\mathcal{M}^+(\mathbf{n})|} \overleftarrow{f}[\mathcal{X}(\mathbf{m})] = m, \tau < \infty\right\}$$

$$= \sum_{l=0}^{k} \mathsf{P}\left\{\overleftarrow{f}[\mathcal{X}(\mathbf{n})] = l \mid \sum_{\mathbf{m}\in|\mathcal{M}^+(\mathbf{n})|} \overleftarrow{f}[\mathcal{X}(\mathbf{m})] = m - 1, \tau < \infty\right\} \tag{4.10}$$

$$\times \mathsf{P}\left\{\overleftarrow{f}[\mathcal{X}(\mathbf{n})] = k - l \mid \sum_{\mathbf{m}\in|\mathcal{M}^+(\mathbf{n})|} \overleftarrow{f}[\mathcal{X}(\mathbf{m})] = 1, \tau < \infty\right\}.$$

Remark 4.4.

$$\mathsf{P}\left\{\overleftarrow{f}[\mathcal{X}(\mathbf{0})] = 1 \mid \tau < \infty\right\} = \mathsf{P}\left\{\overleftarrow{f}(\mathbf{0}) = 1 \mid \tau < \infty\right\} = 1.$$

Theorem 4.5. *For any* $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$ *and all* $k = 0, 1, \ldots,$

$$\mathsf{P}\left\{\overrightarrow{f}(\mathbf{n}) = k \mid \tau < \infty\right\} = \mathsf{P}\left\{\sum_{\mathbf{m}\in\mathcal{M}^-(\mathbf{n})} p(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n}) = k\right\}, \tag{4.11}$$

$$\mathsf{P}\left\{\overleftarrow{f}(\mathbf{n})=k \mid \tau<\infty\right\}=\mathsf{P}\left\{\sum_{\mathbf{m}\in\mathcal{M}^{+}(\mathbf{n})}p(\mathbf{m},\mathbf{n})=k\right\}, \tag{4.12}$$

and

$$\mathsf{P}\left\{f(\mathbf{n})=k \mid \tau<\infty\right\}=\mathsf{P}\left\{P_{\mathbf{n}}=k\right\}. \tag{4.13}$$

Furthermore, for conditional distributions of $\overrightarrow{f}(\mathbf{n})$ *and* $\overleftarrow{f}(\mathbf{n})$ *we have the recurrence relations* ($k=0,1,\ldots;m\geq 2$)*:*

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathsf{P}\left\{\overrightarrow{f}(\mathbf{n})=k \mid \sum_{\mathbf{m}\in\mathcal{M}^{-}(\mathbf{n})}\overrightarrow{f}(\mathbf{m})=1,\tau<\infty\right\}\\&=\frac{d-d_0(\mathbf{n})}{d-d_0(\mathbf{n})+1}\left(\frac{1}{d-d_0(\mathbf{n})+1}\right)^{k},\end{aligned} \tag{4.14}$$

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathsf{P}\left\{\overrightarrow{f}(\mathbf{n})=k \mid \sum_{\mathbf{m}\in\mathcal{M}^{-}(\mathbf{n})}\overrightarrow{f}(\mathbf{m})=m,\tau<\infty\right\}\\&=\sum_{l=0}^{k}\mathsf{P}\left\{\overrightarrow{f}(\mathbf{n})=l \mid \sum_{\mathbf{m}\in\mathcal{M}^{-}(\mathbf{n})}\overrightarrow{f}(\mathbf{m})=m-1,\tau<\infty\right\}\\&\times\mathsf{P}\left\{\overrightarrow{f}(\mathbf{n})=k-l \mid \sum_{\mathbf{m}\in\mathcal{M}^{-}(\mathbf{n})}\overrightarrow{f}(\mathbf{m})=1,\tau<\infty\right\},\end{aligned} \tag{4.15}$$

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathsf{P}\left\{\overleftarrow{f}(\mathbf{n})=k \mid \sum_{\mathbf{m}\in\mathcal{M}^{+}(\mathbf{n})}\overleftarrow{f}(\mathbf{m})=1,\tau<\infty\right\}\\&=\frac{d+d_0(\mathbf{n})}{d+d_0(\mathbf{n})+1}\left(\frac{1}{d+d_0(\mathbf{n})+1}\right)^{k},\end{aligned} \tag{4.16}$$

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathsf{P}\left\{\overleftarrow{f}(\mathbf{n})=k \mid \sum_{\mathbf{m}\in\mathcal{M}^{+}(\mathbf{n})}\overleftarrow{f}(\mathbf{m})=m,\tau<\infty\right\}\\&=\sum_{l=0}^{k}\mathsf{P}\left\{\overleftarrow{f}(\mathbf{n})=l \mid \sum_{\mathbf{m}\in\mathcal{M}^{+}(\mathbf{n})}\overleftarrow{f}(\mathbf{m})=m-1,\tau<\infty\right\}\\&\times\mathsf{P}\left\{\overleftarrow{f}(\mathbf{n})=k-l \mid \sum_{\mathbf{m}\in\mathcal{M}^{+}(\mathbf{n})}\overleftarrow{f}(\mathbf{m})=1,\tau<\infty\right\}.\end{aligned} \tag{4.17}$$

Corollary 4.6. *For the one-dimensional random walk* S_t *we have the following results. For all* $n\neq 0$ *and* $k=1,2,\ldots$

$$\mathsf{P}\left\{\overrightarrow{f}(n)=k\right\}=\frac{1}{2}\mathsf{P}\{Z_{|n|-1}=k\},$$

$$\mathsf{P}\left\{\overleftarrow{f}(n)=k\right\}=\frac{1}{2}\mathsf{P}\{Z_{|n|}=k\},$$

and

$$\mathsf{P}\{f(n)=k\}=\frac{1}{2}\mathsf{P}\{Z_{|n|-1}+Z_{|n|}=k\},$$

and the probabilities $\mathsf{P}\left\{\overrightarrow{f}(n)=0\right\}$, $\mathsf{P}\left\{\overleftarrow{f}(n)=0\right\}$ *and* $\mathsf{P}\{f(n)=0\}$ *are determined from the corresponding normalization conditions.*

Theorem 4.7. *For any* $\mathbf{n}\in\mathbb{Z}^d\setminus\{\mathbf{0}\}$*, we have:*

$$\mathsf{E}\left\{\overrightarrow{f}(\mathbf{n})\mid\tau<\infty\right\}=2^{d_0(\mathbf{n})-d}\mathsf{E}\left\{\overrightarrow{f}[\mathcal{X}(\mathbf{n})]\mid\tau<\infty\right\}=\frac{d-d_0(\mathbf{n})}{2d},\tag{4.18}$$

$$\mathsf{E}\left\{\overrightarrow{f}(\mathbf{n})\mid\tau<\infty\right\}=2^{d_0(\mathbf{n})-d}\mathsf{E}\left\{\overrightarrow{f}[\mathcal{X}(\mathbf{n})]\mid\tau<\infty\right\}=\frac{d+d_0(\mathbf{n})}{2d},\tag{4.19}$$

and

$$\mathsf{E}\{f(\mathbf{n})\mid\tau<\infty\}=2^{d_0(\mathbf{n})-d}\mathsf{E}\{f[\mathcal{X}(\mathbf{n})]\mid\tau<\infty\}=1.\tag{4.20}$$

5. Proof of Theorem 4.1

5.1. **Prelude.** The idea of the proof is based on a special construction as follows. We consider the functional $\varphi_t=\|\mathbf{S}_t\|$. The functional φ_t is defined as follows:

$$\varphi_0 = 0,\tag{5.1}$$

$$\varphi_t = |\varphi_{t-1}+X_t(\varphi_{t-1})|,\quad t\geq 1,\tag{5.2}$$

where $X_t(0)=1$ and

$$X_t(\varphi_{t-1})=\begin{cases}+1, & \text{with certain probability } p_n,\\ -1, & \text{with complementary probability } q_n=1-p_n,\end{cases}\tag{5.3}$$

where the values p_n will be determined later.

According to its construction, the functional φ_t is a birth-and-death process, and our task is to study the distributions of the numbers of up- and down-crossings of the functional φ_t.

In the proof of this and following theorems, it is assumed without loss of generality that in each of its states the random walk stays an exponentially distributed time with parameter 1, prior moving to the next state. Then, the parameter t in $\mathbf{S}_t$ means the tth event of the associated Poisson process with rate 1. The meaning of the random time instant τ is then the τth event of the same Poisson process (i.e. the event with random τth order number). In the sequel, any phrase like *time moment* x means that it is spoken about the xth event of the Poisson process.

5.2. **Lemma on a birth-and-death process.** In this section we prove the following lemma of the general nature.

Lemma 5.1. *Let* ϕ_t *be a birth-and-death process with parameters of birth and death* λ_n *and* μ_n*, respectively. Assume that* $\phi_0=1$*, and let* υ *be the time moment of extinction of the birth-and-death process. (If extinction does not occur, then we set* $\upsilon=\infty$*.) Let* $g(n)$*,* $n\geq 1$*, denote the number of times during the random interval* $[0,\upsilon)$ *when immediately before the time of a birth there become* n *individuals in the population,* $g(0)=1$*. Then,*

$$\mathsf{P}\{g(n)=k\mid\upsilon<\infty\}=\mathsf{P}\{V_n=k\},\tag{5.4}$$

where V_n is the positive integer-valued Markov chain satisfying the following properties:

$$\begin{aligned} V_0 &= 1, \\ \mathsf{P}\{V_{j+1}=k|V_j=1\} &= \frac{\mu_j}{\lambda_j+\mu_j}\cdot\left(\frac{\lambda_j}{\lambda_j+\mu_j}\right)^k, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\mathsf{P}\{V_{j+1}=k|V_j=m\}=\sum_{i=0}^{k}\mathsf{P}\{V_{j+1}=i|V_j=1\}\mathsf{P}\{V_{j+1}=k-i|V_j=m-1\},$$

$j=0,1,\ldots$.

Proof. Let $a_1(j), a_2(j),\ldots, a_{g(j)}(j)$ denote the birth times immediately before there become j individuals in the population, and let $d_1(j)$, $d_2(j),\ldots$, $d_{g(j)}(j)$ denote the death times, after which there are remain only j individuals in the population. Apparently, based in the convention $g(0)=1$, the times $a_1(0)$ and $d_1(0)$ are unique, $a_1(0)$ is the moment of the first birth and $d_1(0)$ is the extinction time. For $1\le j$, the time intervals

$$\Big[a_1(j),d_1(j)\Big),\Big[a_2(j),d_2(j)\Big),\ldots,\Big[a_{g(j)}(j),d_{g(j)}(j)\Big) \tag{5.5}$$

are contained in the intervals

$$\begin{aligned} &\Big[a_1(j-1),d_1(j-1)\Big),\Big[a_2(j-1),d_2(j-1)\Big),\ldots, \\ &\Big[a_{g(j-1)}(j-1),d_{g(j-1)}(j-1)\Big). \end{aligned} \tag{5.6}$$

Let us delete the intervals of (5.5) from those of (5.6) and merge the ends. Then, according to the property of the lack of memory of exponential distribution, the number of merged points in each of the intervals of (5.6) coincides in distribution with the number of births per a death time of an individual in the population (provided that the birth and death rates are unchanged and equal to λ_j and μ_j, respectively) and has geometric distribution with parameter $\lambda_j/(\lambda_j+\mu_j)$. This enables us to conclude that $\{g(j)\}$ has the structure of the branching process, in which the distribution of the number of offspring in the jth generation depends on the order number of generation, j, and is described by the Markov chain V_j. Hence, the conditional distribution of $g(j)$ coincides with the distribution of V_j, and (5.4) follows. □

5.3. **Queueing model of the reflected random walk and derivation of the parameters p_n.** Along with the original random walk in $\mathbb{Z}^d$ given by (1.1) and (1.2) in this section we consider the reflected random walk in $\mathbb{Z}^d_+$, which is defined as follows

$$\mathbf{S}_0 = \mathbf{0}, \tag{5.7}$$

$$\mathbf{S}_t = \mathbf{S}_{t-1}+\mathbf{e}_t(\mathbb{Z}^d_+), \quad t\ge 1, \tag{5.8}$$

where the vector $\mathbf{e}_t(\mathbb{Z}^d_+)$ is, in turn, defined as

$$\mathbf{e}_t(\mathbb{Z}^d_+)=\begin{cases}\mathbf{e}_t, & \text{if } S^{(i)}_{t-1}+e^{(i)}_t\ge 0 \text{ for all } i=1,2,\ldots,d,\\ -\mathbf{e}_t, & \text{if } S^{(i)}_{t-1}+e^{(i)}_t=-1 \text{ for a certain } i=1,2,\ldots,d,\end{cases}$$

where $\mathbf{e}_t = \left(e_t^{(1)}, e_t^{(2)}, \ldots, e_t^{(d)}\right) = \mathbf{e}_t(\mathbb{Z}^d)$. It is important to note that the norms of the original random walk (1.1), (1.2) and reflected random walk (5.7), (5.8) are defined by same way (5.1) and (5.2), and have the same distribution. Hence, by φ_t we refer to as the norm of the reflected random walk. The reflected random walk given by (5.7) and (5.8) can be modeled as follows.

Consider d independent and identical single-server queueing systems. Assume that arrivals in each of these systems are Poisson with rate λ, and service times are exponentially distributed with parameter $\mu = \lambda$. If a queueing system becomes free, it is switched for a special additional service with same rate λ. This service is *negative* in the sense that the result of this service is a new customer in the queue. If during a negative service a new arrival occurs, then the negative service remains unfinished and not resumed. The negative service models reflection at zero and in fact means the doubled arrival rate 2λ when a system is empty.

Note, that the value of parameter λ is in agree with the convention that in each state the original random walk spends exponentially distributed time with mean 1, and we do not care about its exact value.

In order to establish necessary properties of the family of d independent queueing systems, assume first that the number of waiting places in each of the queueing systems is N, where N is taken large enough, such that for any vector $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^d$ considered in the proof, the inequality $\|\mathbf{n}\| < N$ is satisfied. Let $P_N(\mathbf{n})$ denote the stationary probability. In order to obtain the representations for this stationary probability, consider first a single queueing system and derive the relation for $P_N(n)$. By using the Chapman-Kolmogorov system of equations, we obtain

$$P_N(n) = \begin{cases} \frac{2}{2N+1}, & \text{for } 1 \le n \le N, \\ \frac{1}{2N+1}, & \text{for } n = 0. \end{cases} \tag{5.9}$$

Then, keeping in mind that the d queueing system are independent, we have the product form solution

$$P_N(\mathbf{n}) = \prod_{i=1}^{d} P_N\left(n^{(i)}\right). \tag{5.10}$$

Substituting (5.9) into (5.10) we may obtain the exact form solution. Namely,

$$P_N(\mathbf{n}) = 2^{d-d_0(\mathbf{n})} \frac{1}{(2N+1)^d}. \tag{5.11}$$

Recall that $d_0(\mathbf{n})$ is the number of zero components in the presentation of vector $\mathbf{n}$. It turns out from (5.11) that for any two arbitrary vectors $\mathbf{n}_1 \in \mathbb{Z}_+^d$ and $\mathbf{n}_2 \in \mathbb{Z}_+^d$ the ratio of the stationary probabilities

$$\frac{P_N(\mathbf{n}_1)}{P_N(\mathbf{n}_2)} = 2^{d_0(\mathbf{n}_2) - d_0(\mathbf{n}_1)} \tag{5.12}$$

is independent of N.

The total number of vectors having norm n in $\mathbb{Z}_+^d$ is

$$\sum_{i=1}^{d} \binom{d}{i} \binom{n-1}{i-1}.$$

Hence, denoting the stationary state probability to belong to the set $\mathcal{N}^+(n)$ by $P_N[\mathcal{N}^+(n)]$, from (5.11) we obtain

$$P_N[\mathcal{N}^+(n)] = \sum_{\mathbf{n}\in\mathcal{N}^+(n)} P_N(\mathbf{n}) = \frac{1}{(2N+1)^d}\sum_{i=1}^{d} 2^i \binom{d}{i}\binom{n-1}{i-1}, \tag{5.13}$$

where the term $\sum_{i=1}^{d} 2^i \binom{d}{i}\binom{n-1}{i-1}$ on the right-hand side of (5.13) characterizes the total number of elements in $\mathbb{Z}^d$ having norm n.

Let us calculate p_n, the transition probability from the set of states $\mathcal{N}^+(n)$ (level n) to the set of states $\mathcal{N}^+(n+1)$ (level $n+1$).

Note that the total number of zero components in all the vectors from $\mathcal{N}^+(n)$ is

$$\sum_{i=1}^{d-1}(d-i)\binom{d}{i}\binom{n-1}{i-1},$$

and the total number of nonzero components in all the aforementioned vectors is

$$\sum_{i=1}^{d} i\binom{d}{i}\binom{n-1}{i-1}.$$

Then, taking into account (5.11) or (5.13) for the transition probabilities p_n

$$\begin{aligned} p_n &= \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{d-1}(d-i)2^{i+1}\binom{d}{i}\binom{n-1}{i-1} + \sum_{i=1}^{d} i2^i\binom{d}{i}\binom{n-1}{i-1}}{\sum_{i=1}^{d-1}(d-i)2^{i+1}\binom{d}{i}\binom{n-1}{i-1} + \sum_{i=1}^{d} i2^{i+1}\binom{d}{i}\binom{n-1}{i-1}} \\ &= \frac{C_0(n)+C(n)}{C_0(n)+2C(n)}, \end{aligned} \tag{5.14}$$

Relation (5.14) can be easily explained. For level n, the phase space contains

$$2d\sum_{i=1}^{d} 2^i \binom{d}{i}\binom{n-1}{i-1} = C_0(n) + 2C(n)$$

states characterizing the number of possible transitions of the vectors in $\mathbb{Z}^d$ having norm n. Specifically, $C_0(n)$ is the possible number of transitions associated with reflections at zero. The rest of all possible transitions of the phase space is $2C(n)$. Half of them characterize transitions from level n to $n+1$ and half from level n to $n-1$. Thus, the sum $C_0(n)+C(n)$ is the possible number of transitions from level n to $n+1$, which in in the nominator of (5.14). So, relation (5.14) becomes clear, and the random variables $X_t(\varphi_{t-1})$ given in (5.3) are fully defined.

5.4. **Proof of** (4.1)**.** From (5.14) we have $\lambda_j = C_0(j) + C(j)$ and $\mu_j = C(j)$, and now (4.1) follows from Lemma 5.1.

5.5. **Proof of** (4.2) **and** (4.3)**.** Prove first (4.2). Apparently, given that $\tau < \infty$, we have $\overleftarrow{f}[\mathcal{N}(n)] = \overrightarrow{f}[\mathcal{N}(n+1)]$, since the total number of crossings from the level n to $n+1$ must coincide with the total number of crossings from the level $n+1$ to n. Hence, (4.2) follows. Next, $f[\mathcal{N}(n)] = \overrightarrow{f}[\mathcal{N}(n)] + \overleftarrow{f}[\mathcal{N}(n)]$ and (4.3) follows as well.

6. Proof of Theorem 4.3

6.1. **Prelude.** The idea of the proof is to consider first the reflected random walk in $[0,N]^d$ and then, assuming that N increases to infinity, develop the result for the random walk in $\mathbb{Z}_+^d$. In turn, in order to define the random walk in $[0,N]^d$ we are first required to define the random walk in $[-N,N]^d$. The random walk in $[-N,N]^d$ is defined by the recurrence relations

$$\mathbf{S}_0 = \mathbf{0}, \tag{6.1}$$

$$\mathbf{S}_t = \mathbf{S}_{t-1} + \mathbf{e}_t([-N,N]^d), \quad t \geq 1, \tag{6.2}$$

where the vector $\mathbf{e}_t([-N,N]^d)$ is

$$\mathbf{e}_t([-N,N]^d) = \begin{cases} \mathbf{e}_t, & \text{if } \|\mathbf{S}_{t-1} + \mathbf{e}_t\| \leq N; \\ \mathbf{0}, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \tag{6.3}$$

and the vector $\mathbf{e}_t = \mathbf{e}_t(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ in the right-hand side of (6.3) is the vector that was previously defined for the random walk in $\mathbb{Z}^d$ in (1.1) and (1.2). Recall that $\mathbf{e}_t$ is one of the $2d$ vectors $\{\pm\mathbf{1}_i, i = 1,2,\ldots,d\}$ that is randomly chosen with probability $1/(2d)$.

The random walk in $[0,N]^d$ is defined by the recurrence relations

$$\mathbf{S}_0 = \mathbf{0}, \tag{6.4}$$

$$\mathbf{S}_t = \mathbf{S}_{t-1} + \mathbf{e}_t([0,N]^d), \quad t \geq 1, \tag{6.5}$$

where

$$\mathbf{e}_t([0,N]^d) = \begin{cases} \mathbf{e}_t, & \text{for } \|\mathbf{S}_{t-1} + \mathbf{e}_t\| \leq N \text{ and} \\ & S_{t-1}^{(i)} + e_t^{(i)} \geq 0 \text{ for all } i = 1,2,\ldots,d; \\ -\mathbf{e}_t, & \text{for } \|\mathbf{S}_{t-1} + \mathbf{e}_t\| \leq N \text{ and} \\ & S_{t-1}^{(i)} + e_t^{(i)} = -1 \text{ for a certain } i = 1,2,\ldots,d; \\ \mathbf{0}, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \tag{6.6}$$

and the vector $\mathbf{e}_t = \left(e_t^{(1)}, e_t^{(2)}, \ldots, e_t^{(d)}\right) = \mathbf{e}_t(\mathbb{Z}^d)$.

It follows from (6.1) – (6.6) that, compared to the random walk in $[-N,N]^d$, the random walk in $[0,N]^d$ is the *reflected version* of the random walk in $[-N,N]^d$. Specifically, the comparison of the vectors $\mathbf{e}_t([-N,N]^d)$ and $\mathbf{e}_t([0,N]^d)$ defined by (6.3) and (6.6), respectively, clearly shows the mechanism of the reflection. In the limiting case, as $N \to \infty$, the random walks in $\mathbb{Z}^d$ and $\mathbb{Z}_+^d$ satisfy the same property too, the random walk in $\mathbb{Z}_+^d$ is the reflected version of the random walk in $\mathbb{Z}^d$. (The aforementioned limiting case assumes that the random walks in $[-N,N]^d$ and $[0,N]^d$, $N = 1,2,\ldots$ all are defined on a common probability space.) Hence, the conditional distributions of $\overrightarrow{f}(\mathbf{n})$, $\overleftarrow{f}(\mathbf{n})$ and $f(\mathbf{n})$ for the random walk in $\mathbb{Z}_+^d$ (given τ is finite) are equivalent to the conditional distributions of $\overrightarrow{f}[\mathcal{X}(\mathbf{n})]$, $\overleftarrow{f}[\mathcal{X}(\mathbf{n})]$ and $f[\mathcal{X}(\mathbf{n})]$, respectively, for the random walk in $\mathbb{Z}^d$.

Let τ_N denote the time of first return to original point $\mathbf{0}$ for the random walk in $[-N,N]^d$, and let τ'_N denote the time of first return to original point $\mathbf{0}$ for the random walk in $[0,N]^d$. It follows from the definition of the random walks in $[-N,N]^d$ and $[0,N]^d$ that both τ_N and τ'_N coincide in distribution. Therefore, in the sequel we use the only notation τ_N for both of these random walks.

6.2. **Proof of** (4.4)**,** (4.7) **and** (4.8)**.** The random walk in $[0, N]^d$ is modeled by the the d independent queueing systems, the structure of which is described in Section 5.3 with the only difference that the number of waiting places in each of them is equal to N. The capacity parameter N is chosen large enough such that any vector $\mathbf{n}$ considered in the proof satisfies the condition $2 \leq \|\mathbf{n}\| < N$.

At the initial time moment $t = 0$ all queueing systems are assumed to be empty, and after $t = 0$, the first arrival to one of the queueing systems occurs. By busy period we mean the time interval $[1, \tau_N]$. (Recall that the time t is discrete, $t = 1$ is the moment of the first arrival to one of the systems all of which are initially empty, and τ_N means the τ_N's event of Poisson process, at which all the queueing systems become empty once again at the first time since $t = 0$.)

The proof of (4.4) is based on the level-crossing technique similar to that used to prove Lemma 5.1. In the given (multidimensional) case the proof is, however, more complicated and delicate.

Consider first the set of vectors $\mathcal{N}^+(n)$ (the set of all vectors in $\mathbb{Z}_d^+$ with norm n). The arguments for this set of vectors is similar to that provided before in the proof of Lemma 5.1, but are needed here to be recalled. Let $z_n^{(N)}$ denote the number of cases when at the moment of arrival of a customer, the total (cumulative) number of customers in the queueing systems becomes n. Let $a_1^{(N)}(n)$, $a_2^{(N)}(n)$,..., $a_{z_n^{(N)}}^{(N)}(n)$ be the moments of these arrivals, and let $d_1^{(N)}(n)$, $d_2^{(N)}(n)$,..., $d_{z_n^{(N)}}^{(N)}(n)$ be the moments of service completion, when there totally remain $n-1$ customers.

Apparently, the time intervals

$$\left[a_1^{(N)}(n), d_1^{(N)}(n)\right), \left[a_2^{(N)}(n), d_2^{(N)}(n)\right), \ldots, \left[a_{z_n^{(N)}}^{(N)}(n), d_{z_n^{(N)}}^{(N)}(n)\right) \tag{6.7}$$

are contained in the time intervals

$$\begin{aligned} &\left[a_1^{(N)}(n-1), d_1^{(N)}(n-1)\right), \left[a_2^{(N)}(n-1), d_2^{(N)}(n-1)\right), \ldots, \\ &\left[a_{z_{n-1}^{(N)}}^{(N)}(n-1), d_{z_{n-1}^{(N)}}^{(N)}(n-1)\right). \end{aligned} \tag{6.8}$$

Deleting the intervals of (6.7) from those of (6.8) and merging the ends yields the set of points. The residual times in the points intervals merged have an exponential distribution, the parameter of which typically depends on the allocation structure of $n-1$ customers in d queueing systems at the moment of the service completion. For instance, if d_0 servers are empty, then the (residual) service rate is $\lambda(d - d_0)$ and total (residual) arrival rate is $\lambda(d + d_0)$. (The last includes the rate λd_0 of the d_0 negative services).

Let $\mathbf{n}$ be a point that has norm $\|\mathbf{n}\| = n$ and thus belongs to $\mathcal{N}^+(n)$. Denote by $z_{\mathbf{n}}^{(N)}$ the number of cases when at the moment of a customer's arrival to one of the queueing systems, there become $n^{(1)}$, $n^{(2)}$,..., $n^{(d)}$ customers in the corresponding queueing systems, the order numbers of which is indicated by the upper index. Let $a_1^{(N)}(\mathbf{n})$, $a_2^{(N)}(\mathbf{n})$,..., $a_{z_{\mathbf{n}}^{(N)}}^{(N)}(\mathbf{n})$ be the moments of these arrivals, and let $d_1^{(N)}(\mathbf{n})$, $d_2^{(N)}(\mathbf{n})$,..., $d_{z_{\mathbf{n}}^{(N)}}^{(N)}(\mathbf{n})$ be the moments of service completions following the first time after the corresponding times $a_i^{(N)}(\mathbf{n})$, $i = 1, 2, \ldots, z_{\mathbf{n}}^{(N)}$, when there remain $n-1$ customers in total in the d queueing systems.

So, we have the time intervals

$$\left[a_1^{(N)}(\mathbf{n}), d_1^{(N)}(\mathbf{n})\right), \left[a_2^{(N)}(\mathbf{n}), d_2^{(N)}(\mathbf{n})\right), \ldots, \left[a_{z_{\mathbf{n}}^{(N)}}^{(N)}(\mathbf{n}), d_{z_{\mathbf{n}}^{(N)}}^{(N)}(\mathbf{n})\right). \tag{6.9}$$

Note, that if $\mathbf{n} = \mathbf{1}_i$ the time interval $\left[a_1^{(N)}(\mathbf{1}_i), d_1^{(N)}(\mathbf{1}_i)\right)$, if it is, coincides with the busy period $[1, \tau_N]$, and

$$\mathsf{P}\left\{z_{\mathbf{1}_i}^{(N)} = 1\right\} = \frac{1}{d}, \quad \mathsf{P}\left\{z_{\mathbf{1}_i}^{(N)} = 0\right\} = \frac{d-1}{d}, \quad i = 1, 2, \ldots, d, \tag{6.10}$$

together with the condition

$$\sum_{i=1}^{d} z_{\mathbf{1}_i}^{(N)} = 1. \tag{6.11}$$

Note, that any two differences $a_2^{(N)}(\mathbf{n}) - a_1^{(N)}(\mathbf{n})$ and $a_{i+1}^{(N)}(\mathbf{n}) - a_i^{(N)}(\mathbf{n})$ $(i \geq 2)$ (if exist) are identically distributed, so $a_i^{(N)}(\mathbf{n})$ have a structure of regeneration points.

Now, let $\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{M}^-(\mathbf{n})$, and let $z_{\mathbf{m}}^{(N)}$ denote the number of arrivals, at the time of which there become $m^{(1)}$, $m^{(2)}$,..., $m^{(d)}$ numbers of customers in the corresponding queueing systems, the order numbers of which are indicated by the upper index. Then, for each of the vectors $\mathbf{m}$ from the set $\mathcal{M}^-(\mathbf{n})$ one can define the sequences $a_1^{(N)}(\mathbf{m})$, $a_2^{(N)}(\mathbf{m})$,..., $a_{z_{\mathbf{m}}^{(N)}}^{(N)}(\mathbf{m})$ and $d_1^{(N)}(\mathbf{m})$, $d_2^{(N)}(\mathbf{m})$,..., $d_{z_{\mathbf{m}}^{(N)}}^{(N)}(\mathbf{m})$ and the intervals

$$\left[a_1^{(N)}(\mathbf{m}), d_1^{(N)}(\mathbf{m})\right), \left[a_2^{(N)}(\mathbf{m}), d_2^{(N)}(\mathbf{m})\right), \ldots, \left[a_{z_{\mathbf{m}}^{(N)}}^{(N)}(\mathbf{m}), d_{z_{\mathbf{m}}^{(N)}}^{(N)}(\mathbf{m})\right) \tag{6.12}$$

by the similar way as before. Apparently, there are intervals defined by (6.9) that are contained in the set of intervals (6.12), and let their number be $z_{\mathbf{n},\mathbf{m}}^{(N)}$.

Let us delete the intervals of (6.9) from those of (6.12) and merge the ends. Note, that with $n = \|\mathbf{n}\|$ the set of intervals defined by (6.12) is a subset of the system of intervals given by (6.8), and the set of intervals given by (6.9) is a subset of intervals given by (6.7). Let us remove all intervals of (6.8) that are not (6.12) and all intervals of (6.7) that are not (6.9). Then, the aforementioned merged points of the intervals of (6.9) imbedded into the intervals of (6.12) have a structure of regeneration points (the differences between merged points have the same distribution) and satisfy the following properties. First, the residual times to the next arrival or service completion both distributed exponentially. The mean time to the next arrival that occurs from state $\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{M}^-(\mathbf{n})$ to the state $\mathbf{n}$ depends on the state $\mathbf{m}$. More specifically, the equality $\mathsf{card}[\mathcal{M}^-(\mathbf{m})] = \mathsf{card}[\mathcal{M}^-(\mathbf{n})]$ implies that the aforementioned mean time to the next arrival is $1/\lambda$. However, if $\mathsf{card}[\mathcal{M}^-(\mathbf{m})] = \mathsf{card}[\mathcal{M}^-(\mathbf{n})] - 1$, then because of the reflection at zero, the mean time to the next arrival is $1/(2\lambda)$. The mean residual time to a service completion depends on state $\mathbf{m}$ too. Being equal to $1/\{\lambda\mathsf{card}[\mathcal{M}^-(\mathbf{m})]\}$, it is $1/[\lambda(d - d_0(\mathbf{n}))]$ is the case of $\mathsf{card}[\mathcal{M}^-(\mathbf{m})] = \mathsf{card}[\mathcal{M}^-(\mathbf{n})]$, and $1/[\lambda(d - d_0(\mathbf{n}) - 1)]$ in the case of $\mathsf{card}[\mathcal{M}^-(\mathbf{m})] = \mathsf{card}[\mathcal{M}^-(\mathbf{n})] - 1$. Hence, the number of merged points within an arbitrary interval $\left[a_j^{(N)}(\mathbf{m}), d_j^{(N)}(\mathbf{m})\right)$, due to the property of the lack of memory of exponential distribution, has a geometric distribution, which is the same for any j. The parameter of this geometric distribution depends on $\mathbf{m}$. If $\mathsf{card}[\mathcal{M}^-(\mathbf{m})] = \mathsf{card}[\mathcal{M}^-(\mathbf{n})]$, then it is equal to $1/(d - d_0(\mathbf{n}) + 1)$. That is, for

$k = 0, 1, \ldots,$

$$\mathsf{P}\left\{z_{\mathbf{n},\mathbf{m}}^{(N)} = k \mid z_{\mathbf{m}}^{(N)} = 1\right\} = \frac{d - d_0(\mathbf{n})}{d - d_0(\mathbf{n}) + 1}\left(\frac{1}{d - d_0(\mathbf{n}) + 1}\right)^k. \tag{6.13}$$

If $\mathsf{card}[\mathcal{M}^-(\mathbf{m})] = \mathsf{card}[\mathcal{M}^-(\mathbf{n})] - 1$, then the parameter value is $2/(d - d_0(\mathbf{n}) + 1)$. That is, for $k = 0, 1, \ldots,$

$$\mathsf{P}\left\{z_{\mathbf{n},\mathbf{m}}^{(N)} = k \mid z_{\mathbf{m}}^{(N)} = 1\right\} = \frac{d - d_0(\mathbf{n}) - 1}{d - d_0(\mathbf{n}) + 1}\left(\frac{2}{d - d_0(\mathbf{n}) + 1}\right)^k. \tag{6.14}$$

Let us now distinguish the different elements of $\mathcal{M}^-(\mathbf{n})$. Since $\mathsf{card}[\mathcal{M}^-(\mathbf{n})] = d - d_0(\mathbf{n})$ (see Remark 2.9), then the elements of $\mathcal{M}^-(\mathbf{n})$ can be denoted by $\mathbf{m}_1$, $\mathbf{m}_2, \ldots, \mathbf{m}_{d-d_0(\mathbf{n})}$. Then,

$$z_{\mathbf{n}}^{(N)} = z_{\mathbf{n},\mathbf{m}_1}^{(N)} + z_{\mathbf{n},\mathbf{m}_2}^{(N)} + \ldots + z_{\mathbf{n},\mathbf{m}_{d-d_0(\mathbf{n})}}^{(N)}, \tag{6.15}$$

where $z_{\mathbf{n},\mathbf{m}_1}^{(N)}$, $z_{\mathbf{n},\mathbf{m}_2}^{(N)}, \ldots,$ $z_{\mathbf{n},\mathbf{m}_{d-d_0(\mathbf{n})}}^{(N)}$ are independent random variables.

For any index i, $i = 1, 2, \ldots, d - d_0(\mathbf{n})$, one of the following two conditions is satisfied: either

$$\mathsf{card}[\mathcal{M}^-(\mathbf{m}_i)] = \mathsf{card}[\mathcal{M}^-(\mathbf{n})] \tag{6.16}$$

or

$$\mathsf{card}[\mathcal{M}^-(\mathbf{m}_i)] = \mathsf{card}[\mathcal{M}^-(\mathbf{n})] - 1. \tag{6.17}$$

Apparently, the number of indices i for which (6.17) is satisfied is $d_1(\mathbf{n})$ and (6.16) is satisfied for the rest $d - d_0(\mathbf{n}) - d_1(\mathbf{n})$ indices. Recall that $d_1(\mathbf{n})$ denotes the number of unit coordinates in the presentation of the vector $\mathbf{n}$.

Following relation (5.11) given in the proof of Theorem 4.1, each of the vectors $\mathbf{m}_i$ satisfying (6.16) appears two times frequently compared to the other vectors $\mathbf{m}_i$ satisfying (6.17). Hence, based on (6.13) and (6.14) we obtain the following relation

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathsf{P}\left\{z_{\mathbf{n}}^{(N)} = k | z_{\mathbf{m}_1}^{(N)} + z_{\mathbf{m}_2}^{(N)} + \ldots + z_{\mathbf{m}_{d-d_0(\mathbf{n})}}^{(N)} = 1\right\} \\
&= \frac{2[d - d_0(\mathbf{n}) - d_1(\mathbf{n})]}{2[d - d_0(\mathbf{n})] - d_1(\mathbf{n})} \cdot \frac{d - d_0(\mathbf{n})}{d - d_0(\mathbf{n}) + 1}\left(\frac{1}{d - d_0(\mathbf{n}) + 1}\right)^k \\
&+ \frac{d_1(\mathbf{n})}{2[d - d_0(\mathbf{n})] - d_1(\mathbf{n})} \cdot \frac{d - d_0(\mathbf{n}) - 1}{d - d_0(\mathbf{n}) + 1}\left(\frac{2}{d - d_0(\mathbf{n}) + 1}\right)^k.
\end{aligned} \tag{6.18}$$

As well, in addition to (6.18), for $m \geq 2$ and $k = 0, 1, \ldots$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathsf{P}\left\{z_{\mathbf{n}}^{(N)} = k | z_{\mathbf{m}_1}^{(N)} + z_{\mathbf{m}_2}^{(N)} + \ldots + z_{\mathbf{m}_{d-d_0(\mathbf{n})}}^{(N)} = m\right\} \\
&= \sum_{l=0}^{k} \mathsf{P}\left\{z_{\mathbf{n}}^{(N)} = l | z_{\mathbf{m}_1}^{(N)} + z_{\mathbf{m}_2}^{(N)} + \ldots + z_{\mathbf{m}_{d-d_0(\mathbf{n})}}^{(N)} = 1\right\} \\
&\times \mathsf{P}\left\{z_{\mathbf{n}}^{(N)} = k - l | z_{\mathbf{m}_1}^{(N)} + z_{\mathbf{m}_2}^{(N)} + \ldots + z_{\mathbf{m}_{d-d_0(\mathbf{n})}}^{(N)} = m - 1\right\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{6.19}$$

Notice now, that in the obtained representations given by (6.13), (6.18) and (6.19), the right-hand sides do not depend on N, so the result might be true in the limiting case as N increases to infinity, if the limiting distribution of $\overrightarrow{f}[\mathcal{X}(\mathbf{n})]$ is proper.

Assume now that the queueing processes generated by the d queueing systems with different N are given on the same probability probability space, that is, the

associated with these queueing processes the system of the fields $z_{\mathbf{n}}^{(N)}$ is given on the common probability space. Assume that the queueing process generated by the d queueing systems with infinite capacities is defined on the same probability space as well, and let $z_{\mathbf{n}}^{(\infty)}$ denote the corresponding system of fields associated with these d queueing systems with infinite capacity and having the same meaning. Apparently,

$$\{\tau < \infty\} = \left\{ \sum_{\mathbf{m}>\mathbf{0}} z_{\mathbf{m}}^{(\infty)} < \infty \right\} \supseteq \bigcup_{N\geq 1} \left\{ \sum_{\|\mathbf{m}\|\leq N} z_{\mathbf{m}}^{(N)} < \infty \right\}.$$

Hence,

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathsf{P}\left\{ \overrightarrow{f}\,[\mathcal{X}(\mathbf{n})] = k \mid \tau < \infty \right\} = 1. \tag{6.20}$$

Now, representation (6.15) together with (6.13), (6.14) and (6.20), in the limiting scheme as $N \to \infty$, establish relation (4.4), since the required properties of the random field $Q_{\mathbf{n}}$ are satisfied. In turn, relations (6.18), (6.19) and (6.20) enable us to conclude the justice of (4.7) and (4.8).

6.3. **Proof of** (4.5)**,** (4.9)**,** (4.10) **and** (4.6)**.** The proof of (4.5) is technically similar to that of (4.4). We define the system of intervals (6.12) where $\mathbf{m}$ belongs now to $|\mathcal{M}^{+}(\mathbf{n})|$. Then, the intervals of (6.9) are contained in those of (6.12). Deleting (6.9) from (6.12) and merging the ends, we obtain the set of points, the number of which is denoted by $z_{\mathbf{n},\mathbf{m}}^{(N)}$. By similar arguments to those used in the proof in Section 6.2, we arrive at the relation

$$\mathsf{P}\left\{ z_{\mathbf{n},\mathbf{m}}^{(N)} = k \mid z_{\mathbf{m}}^{(N)} = 1 \right\} = \frac{d + d_0(\mathbf{n}) - r(\mathbf{m}) + 1}{d + d_0(\mathbf{n}) + 1} \left(\frac{r(\mathbf{m})}{d + d_0(\mathbf{n}) + 1} \right)^{k} \tag{6.21}$$

for $k = 0, 1, \ldots$. Recall that $r(\mathbf{m})$ is the range of $\mathbf{m} \in |\mathcal{M}^{+}(\mathbf{n})|$ (see Definition 2.14). Similarly to way in the proof given in Section 6.2 we are to distinguish the elements of $|\mathcal{M}^{+}(\mathbf{n})|$. The number of elements in $|\mathcal{M}^{+}(\mathbf{n})|$ having range 2 is $d_0(\mathbf{n})$ and $\mathsf{card}(|\mathcal{M}^{+}(\mathbf{n})|) = d$ (see Remark 2.15). Then the elements of the set $|\mathcal{M}^{+}(\mathbf{n})|$ can be numbered $\mathbf{m}_1$, $\mathbf{m}_2$,..., $\mathbf{m}_d$. Then,

$$z_{\mathbf{n}}^{(N)} = z_{\mathbf{n},\mathbf{m}_1}^{(N)} + z_{\mathbf{n},\mathbf{m}_2}^{(N)} + \ldots + z_{\mathbf{n},\mathbf{m}_d}^{(N)}, \tag{6.22}$$

where $z_{\mathbf{n},\mathbf{m}_1}^{(N)}$, $z_{\mathbf{n},\mathbf{m}_2}^{(N)}$,..., $z_{\mathbf{n},\mathbf{m}_d}^{(N)}$ are independent random variables.

Relation (6.22) together with (6.21) in the limit as $N \to \infty$ establish (4.5), since the required properties of the field $Q_{\mathbf{n}}$ are satisfied.

Next, following relation (5.11) given in the proof of Theorem 4.1, each of the vectors of range 2 appears two times frequently compared to a vector of range 1. That is, among the vectors $\mathbf{m}_1$, $\mathbf{m}_2$,..., $\mathbf{m}_d$, the $d_0(\mathbf{n})$ vectors of range 2 have the total weight of $2d_0(\mathbf{n})$, while the rest $d - d_0(\mathbf{n})$ vectors are of the total weight of

$d - d_0(\mathbf{n})$. Hence, for $k = 0, 1, \ldots$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathsf{P}\left\{z_{\mathbf{n}}^{(N)} = k | z_{\mathbf{m}_1}^{(N)} + z_{\mathbf{m}_2}^{(N)} + \ldots + z_{\mathbf{m}_d}^{(N)} = 1\right\} \\ &= \frac{2d_0(\mathbf{n})}{d + d_0(\mathbf{n})} \cdot \frac{d + d_0(\mathbf{n}) - 1}{d + d_0(\mathbf{n}) + 1} \left(\frac{2}{d + d_0(\mathbf{n}) + 1}\right)^k \\ &+ \frac{d - d_0(\mathbf{n})}{d + d_0(\mathbf{n})} \cdot \frac{d + d_0(\mathbf{n})}{d + d_0(\mathbf{n}) + 1} \left(\frac{1}{d + d_0(\mathbf{n}) + 1}\right)^k, \end{aligned} \tag{6.23}$$

and for $m \geq 2$ and $k = 0, 1, \ldots$

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathsf{P}\left\{z_{\mathbf{n}}^{(N)} = k | z_{\mathbf{m}_1}^{(N)} + z_{\mathbf{m}_2}^{(N)} + \ldots + z_{\mathbf{m}_d}^{(N)} = m\right\} \\ &= \sum_{l=0}^{k} \mathsf{P}\left\{z_{\mathbf{n}}^{(N)} = l | z_{\mathbf{m}_1}^{(N)} + z_{\mathbf{m}_2}^{(N)} + \ldots + z_{\mathbf{m}_d}^{(N)} = 1\right\} \\ &\times \mathsf{P}\left\{z_{\mathbf{n}}^{(N)} = k - l | z_{\mathbf{m}_1}^{(N)} + z_{\mathbf{m}_2}^{(N)} + \ldots + z_{\mathbf{m}_d}^{(N)} = m - 1\right\}. \end{aligned} \tag{6.24}$$

Relations (6.23) and (6.24) in the limiting case as $N \to \infty$ correspond to the required relation (4.9) and (4.10) of the theorem.

In turn, the proof of (4.6) follows from the relation

$$f[\mathcal{X}(\mathbf{n})] = \overrightarrow{f}[\mathcal{X}(\mathbf{n})] + \overleftarrow{f}[\mathcal{X}(\mathbf{n})].$$

The proof of Theorem 4.3 is completed.

7. Proof of Theorem 4.5 and Corollary 4.6

7.1. **Proof of Theorem 4.5.** The proof of Theorem 4.5 is similar to the proof of Theorem 4.3, but logically simpler. Therefore, we concentrate mostly on the differences within these proofs. The stochastic process that describes the random walk in $\mathbb{Z}^d$ is symmetric. Hence, like the process that describes the reflected random walk, it can be studied in the main orthant of space $\mathbb{Z}^d$, that is, in subspace $\mathbb{Z}_+^d$. Similarly to the proof of Theorem 4.3, first consider the d independent queueing systems $M/M/1/N$ with equal arrival and service rate λ (the queueing systems are standard, that is, *without negative service*) and we build the intervals given by (6.9) and (6.12), deleting then the intervals of (6.9) from those (6.12) and merging the ends as before. Then, together with the conditions

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathsf{P}\left\{z_{\mathbf{1}_i}^{(N)} = 1\right\} = \mathsf{P}\left\{z_{-\mathbf{1}_i}^{(N)} = 1\right\} = \frac{1}{2d}, \\ &\mathsf{P}\left\{z_{\mathbf{1}_i}^{(N)} = 0\right\} = \mathsf{P}\left\{z_{-\mathbf{1}_i}^{(N)} = 0\right\} = \frac{2d - 1}{2d}, \\ &i = 1, 2, \ldots, d \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\sum_{i=1}^{d} z_{\mathbf{1}_i}^{(N)} + \sum_{i=1}^{d} z_{-\mathbf{1}_i}^{(N)} = 1,$$

we also obtain

$$\mathsf{P}\left\{z_{\mathbf{n},\mathbf{m}}^{(N)} = k \mid z_{\mathbf{m}}^{(N)} = 1\right\} = \frac{d - d_0(\mathbf{n})}{d - d_0(\mathbf{n}) + 1} \left(\frac{1}{d - d_0(\mathbf{n}) + 1}\right)^k, \tag{7.1}$$

for $\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{M}^-(\mathbf{n})$, and

$$\mathsf{P}\left\{z_{\mathbf{n},\mathbf{m}}^{(N)} = k \mid z_{\mathbf{m}}^{(N)} = 1\right\} = \frac{d + d_0(\mathbf{n})}{d + d_0(\mathbf{n}) + 1}\left(\frac{1}{d + d_0(\mathbf{n}) + 1}\right)^k \tag{7.2}$$

for $\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{M}^+(\mathbf{n})$. Here, in (7.1) and (7.2) the random variable $z_{\mathbf{n},\mathbf{m}}^{(N)}$ has the same meaning as that in the proof of Theorem 4.3.

That is, instead of two different cases for $\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{M}^-(\mathbf{n})$ given by (6.13) and (6.14) and two different cases for $\mathbf{m} \in |\mathcal{M}^+(\mathbf{n})|$ given by (6.21) ($r(\mathbf{m})$ takes values 1 or 2) in the proof of Theorem 4.3, we have the only unique cases for $\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{M}^-(\mathbf{n})$ and $\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{M}^+(\mathbf{n})$ given by (7.1) and (7.2), respectively, in the proof of this theorem.

Distinguishing the different elements of $\mathcal{M}^-(\mathbf{n})$ and denoting them by $\mathbf{m}_1$, $\mathbf{m}_2,\ldots,$ $\mathbf{m}_{d-d_0(\mathbf{n})}$, we have

$$z_{\mathbf{n}}^{(N)} = z_{\mathbf{n},\mathbf{m}_1}^{(N)} + z_{\mathbf{n},\mathbf{m}_2}^{(N)} + z_{\mathbf{n},\mathbf{m}_{d-d_0(\mathbf{n})}}^{(N)}. \tag{7.3}$$

Together with (7.3), we also have recurrence relation ($k = 0, 1, \ldots; m \geq 2$)

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathsf{P}\left\{z_{\mathbf{n}}^{(N)} = k | z_{\mathbf{m}_1}^{(N)} + z_{\mathbf{m}_2}^{(N)} + \ldots + z_{\mathbf{m}_{d-d_0(\mathbf{n})}}^{(N)} = 1\right\}\\ &= \frac{d - d_0(\mathbf{n})}{d - d_0(\mathbf{n}) + 1}\left(\frac{1}{d - d_0(\mathbf{n}) + 1}\right)^k\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathsf{P}\left\{z_{\mathbf{n}}^{(N)} = k | z_{\mathbf{m}_1}^{(N)} + z_{\mathbf{m}_2}^{(N)} + \ldots + z_{\mathbf{m}_{d-d_0(\mathbf{n})}}^{(N)} = m\right\}\\ &= \sum_{l=0}^{k} \mathsf{P}\left\{z_{\mathbf{n}}^{(N)} = l | z_{\mathbf{m}_1}^{(N)} + z_{\mathbf{m}_2}^{(N)} + \ldots + z_{\mathbf{m}_{d-d_0(\mathbf{n})}}^{(N)} = 1\right\}\\ &\times \mathsf{P}\left\{z_{\mathbf{n}}^{(N)} = k - l | z_{\mathbf{m}_1}^{(N)} + z_{\mathbf{m}_2}^{(N)} + \ldots + z_{\mathbf{m}_{d-d_0(\mathbf{n})}}^{(N)} = m - 1\right\}.\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, the different elements of $\mathcal{M}^+(\mathbf{n})$ are distinguished as $\mathbf{m}_1$, $\mathbf{m}_2,\ldots,$ $\mathbf{m}_{d+d_0(\mathbf{n})}$, and similarly to (7.3) we have

$$z_{\mathbf{n}}^{(N)} = z_{\mathbf{n},\mathbf{m}_1}^{(N)} + z_{\mathbf{n},\mathbf{m}_2}^{(N)} + z_{\mathbf{n},\mathbf{m}_{d+d_0(\mathbf{n})}}^{(N)}. \tag{7.4}$$

Together with (7.4) we have recurrence relation ($k = 0, 1, \ldots; m \geq 2$)

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathsf{P}\left\{z_{\mathbf{n}}^{(N)} = k | z_{\mathbf{m}_1}^{(N)} + z_{\mathbf{m}_2}^{(N)} + \ldots + z_{\mathbf{m}_{d+d_0(\mathbf{n})}}^{(N)} = 1\right\}\\ &= \frac{d + d_0(\mathbf{n})}{d + d_0(\mathbf{n}) + 1}\left(\frac{1}{d + d_0(\mathbf{n}) + 1}\right)^k\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathsf{P}\left\{z_{\mathbf{n}}^{(N)} = k | z_{\mathbf{m}_1}^{(N)} + z_{\mathbf{m}_2}^{(N)} + \ldots + z_{\mathbf{m}_{d+d_0(\mathbf{n})}}^{(N)} = m\right\}\\ &= \sum_{l=0}^{k} \mathsf{P}\left\{z_{\mathbf{n}}^{(N)} = l | z_{\mathbf{m}_1}^{(N)} + z_{\mathbf{m}_2}^{(N)} + \ldots + z_{\mathbf{m}_{d+d_0(\mathbf{n})}}^{(N)} = 1\right\}\\ &\times \mathsf{P}\left\{z_{\mathbf{n}}^{(N)} = k - l | z_{\mathbf{m}_1}^{(N)} + z_{\mathbf{m}_2}^{(N)} + \ldots + z_{\mathbf{m}_{d+d_0(\mathbf{n})}}^{(N)} = m - 1\right\}.\end{aligned}$$

Keeping then the similar techniques of the proof as in Theorem 4.3, under the condition $\{\tau < \infty\}$ we obtain the analog of (6.20)

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathsf{P}\left\{\overrightarrow{f}(\mathbf{n}) = k \mid \tau < \infty\right\} = 1,$$

and all the results formulated in Theorem 4.5 follow in limit as $N \to \infty$.

The proof of (4.13) follows from the relation

$$f(\mathbf{n}) = \overrightarrow{f}(\mathbf{n}) + \overleftarrow{f}(\mathbf{n}).$$

The proof of Theorem 4.5 is completed.

7.2. **Proof of Corollary 4.6.** The proof of the corollary follows immediately both from Theorem 4.1 and Theorem 4.5.

8. Proof of Theorem 4.7

First of all note, then in the case $d = 1$ the results follow immediately from Corollary 4.6. Indeed, taking into account that the branching process Z_n is a martingale, we have $\mathsf{E}Z_n = 1$, and all the required results in the case $d = 1$ follow from this property. In the case where $d > 1$, the results cannot be retrieved from Theorems 4.3 or 4.5, since the properties of random fields similar to these properties of stochastic sequences to be a martingale are unknown. Hence, the proof of this theorem is independent of the results obtained in Theorems 4.3 and 4.5 and must be originated. Let us consider the model of d independent queueing systems (with infinite capacities) considered in Section 5.3. The result in (5.11) and relation (6.20) enables us to conclude that if

$$\mathsf{E}\{f[\mathcal{X}(\mathbf{n})] \mid \tau < \infty\} < \infty, \tag{8.1}$$

is satisfied for all $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^d \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$, then for any two arbitrary vectors $\mathbf{n}_1 \in \mathbb{Z}_+^d \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$ and $\mathbf{n}_2 \in \mathbb{Z}_+^d \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$, we have the equality

$$\mathsf{E}\{f[\mathcal{X}(\mathbf{n}_1)] \mid \tau < \infty\} = 2^{d_0(\mathbf{n}_2) - d_0(\mathbf{n}_1)} \mathsf{E}\{f[\mathcal{X}(\mathbf{n}_2)] \mid \tau < \infty\}. \tag{8.2}$$

In particular, if $\mathbf{n}_1 \geq \mathbf{1}$ and $\mathbf{n}_2 \geq \mathbf{1}$, then

$$\mathsf{E}\{f[\mathcal{X}(\mathbf{n}_1)] \mid \tau < \infty\} = \mathsf{E}\{f[\mathcal{X}(\mathbf{n}_2)] \mid \tau < \infty\}.$$

In turn, due to (8.2), relation (8.1) is to be correct, if it is satisfied at least for a certain given value $\mathbf{n}_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_+^d \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$.

According to evident Remark 4.4 and the fact that $\varphi_t = \|\mathbf{S}_t\|$ is a birth-and-death process (see Section 5), we arrive at the conclusion that $\mathsf{E}\{f[\mathcal{X}(\mathbf{1}_i)] \mid \tau < \infty\} < \infty$, $i = 1, 2, \ldots, d$. Hence, (8.1) follows.

On the other hand,

$$\mathsf{E}\{f[\mathcal{X}(\mathbf{n})] \mid \tau < \infty\} = \sum_{\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{X}(\mathbf{n})} \mathsf{E}\{f(\mathbf{m}) \mid \tau < \infty\}.$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathsf{E}\{f(\mathbf{m}) \mid \tau < \infty\} = 2^{d_0(\mathbf{n}) - d} \mathsf{E}\{f[\mathcal{X}(\mathbf{n})] \mid \tau < \infty\}, \\ &\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{X}(\mathbf{n}), \quad \mathbf{m} \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}. \end{aligned} \tag{8.3}$$

It follows from (8.2) and (8.3) that

$$\mathsf{E}\{f(\mathbf{n}) \mid \tau < \infty\} = c, \tag{8.4}$$

where c is the same constant for for all $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$, and the task is to prove that $c = 1$. This task will be provided later as a consequence of the other proofs provided below.

Let us prove first (4.18) and (4.19).

Relation (8.4) implies that all vectors $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$ are equally likely and in particular all those having a given norm $n = \|\mathbf{n}\|$. For the sake of simplicity, we restrict out attention with the case $\mathbf{n} \geq \mathbf{0}$. Assume that $n^{(i)} = 0$, while $n^{(j)} > 0$. Then, elementary combinatorial arguments yield the relation

$$\mathsf{E}\left\{\overrightarrow{f}(\mathbf{n}+\mathbf{1}_i) \mid \tau < \infty\right\} = \frac{d - d_0(\mathbf{n}) + 1}{d - d_0(\mathbf{n})} \mathsf{E}\left\{\overrightarrow{f}(\mathbf{n}+\mathbf{1}_j) \mid \tau < \infty\right\}. \tag{8.5}$$

Taking into account that

$$\mathsf{E}\left\{\overrightarrow{f}(\mathbf{1}_i) \mid \tau < \infty\right\} = \mathsf{E}\left\{\overrightarrow{f}(-\mathbf{1}_i) \mid \tau < \infty\right\} = \frac{1}{2d}, \quad i = 1, 2, \ldots, d,$$

from (8.5) we obtain

$$\mathsf{E}\left\{\overrightarrow{f}(\mathbf{n}) \mid \tau < \infty\right\} = \frac{d - d_0(\mathbf{n})}{2d},$$

and by keeping in mind (8.3) arrive at (4.18). The proof of (4.19) is similar.

Both (4.18) and (4.19) enable us to find

$$\mathsf{E}\{f(\mathbf{n}) \mid \tau < \infty\} = \mathsf{E}\left\{\overrightarrow{f}(\mathbf{n}) \mid \tau < \infty\right\} + \mathsf{E}\left\{\overleftarrow{f}(\mathbf{n}) \mid \tau < \infty\right\} = 1.$$

Hence, the constant c in (8.4) is 1.

9. A-directed state-crossings

Let us now discuss the distribution of the number of A-crossings. In the particular cases where $A \subset \mathcal{M}^-(\mathbf{n})$ or $A \subset \mathcal{M}^+(\mathbf{n})$ the result is trivially expressed via the corresponding distributions of $\overrightarrow{f}(\mathbf{n})$ and $\overleftarrow{f}(\mathbf{n})$. Specifically we have as follows. Let

$$z^- = \frac{\mathsf{card}(A^-)}{\mathsf{card}(\mathcal{M}^-(\mathbf{n}))},$$

and

$$z^+ = \frac{\mathsf{card}(A^+)}{\mathsf{card}(\mathcal{M}^+(\mathbf{n}))}$$

(for the definition of A^- and A^+ see Remark 2.18).

Proposition 9.1. *If $A \subset \mathcal{M}^-(\mathbf{n})$, then for all $k = 0, 1, \ldots$*

$$\mathsf{P}\{f_A(\mathbf{n}) = k \mid \tau < \infty\} = \sum_{l=k}^{\infty} \binom{l}{k} (z^-)^k (1 - z^-)^{l-k} \mathsf{P}\left\{\overrightarrow{f}(\mathbf{n}) = l \mid \tau < \infty\right\}.$$

Similarly, if $A \subset \mathcal{M}^+(\mathbf{n})$, then for all $k = 0, 1, \ldots$

$$\mathsf{P}\{f_A(\mathbf{n}) = k \mid \tau < \infty\} = \sum_{l=k}^{\infty} \binom{l}{k} (z^+)^k (1 - z^+)^{l-k} \mathsf{P}\left\{\overleftarrow{f}(\mathbf{n}) = l \mid \tau < \infty\right\}.$$

Proof. The proof of Proposition 9.1 follows from the total probability formula. □

While Proposition 9.1 represents the marginal cases, the probability distribution of $f_A(\mathbf{n})$ in the general case, where A^- and A^+ both are nonempty sets, is very hard to obtain. So, an *open problem* remains to find (estimate) the distribution of $f_A(\mathbf{n})$.

TABLE 1. Comparison table for the property of conditional expectations of the numbers of state-crossings and crossings the sets of states

One-dimensional random walk	Multidimensional random walk
The expectations are the same for all values n, $n \neq 0$	The conditional expectations are the same for all vectors $\mathbf{n}$, $\mathbf{n} \neq \mathbf{0}$
for $\overrightarrow{f}(n)$ – *true*	for $\overrightarrow{f}(\mathbf{n})$ – *true*; for $\overrightarrow{f}[\mathcal{N}(n)]$ – *false*
for $\overleftarrow{f}(n)$ – *true*	for $\overleftarrow{f}(\mathbf{n})$ – *true*; for $\overleftarrow{f}[\mathcal{N}(n)]$ – *false*
for $f(n)$ – *true*	for $f(\mathbf{n})$ – *true*; for $f[\mathcal{N}(n)]$ – *false*
for $\overrightarrow{f}(\{-n, n\})$ – *true*	for $\overrightarrow{f}[\mathcal{X}(\mathbf{n})]$ – *false* in general and *true* for all $\lvert\mathbf{n}\rvert \geq \mathbf{1}$
for $\overleftarrow{f}(\{-n, n\})$ – *true*	for $\overleftarrow{f}[\mathcal{X}(\mathbf{n})]$ – *false* in general and *true* for all $\lvert\mathbf{n}\rvert \geq \mathbf{1}$
for $f(\{-n, n\})$ – *true*	for $f[\mathcal{X}(\mathbf{n})]$ – *false* in general and *true* for all $\lvert\mathbf{n}\rvert \geq \mathbf{1}$

10. SUMMARY OF THE RESULTS AND THEIR FURTHER EXTENSION

In this paper, a comprehensive analysis of the numbers of state-crossings and the numbers of crossings specifically defined sets of states is provided. The explicit representations for conditional distributions and expectations of the numbers of crossings the states $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$ and the sets of states $\mathcal{X}(\mathbf{n})$ and $\mathcal{N}(\|\mathbf{n}\|)$ are obtained.

In Table 1, we survey the properties of the conditional expectations of the numbers of state-crossings and crossings sets of states. Specifically, we address the question, whether or not these conditional expectations are the same for different vectors $\mathbf{n}$.

The results obtained in the paper are related to the Pólya random walk, which has been well-known since 1921. Consider a more general *symmetric* random walk (see [1]) given by the relations

$$\mathbf{S}_0 = \mathbf{0}, \tag{10.1}$$

$$\mathbf{S}_t = \mathbf{S}_{t-1} + \widetilde{\mathbf{e}}_t, \quad t \geq 1, \tag{10.2}$$

where the vector $\widetilde{\mathbf{e}}_t$ is defined as follows. As in (1.1) and (1.2), it is one of the $2d$ vectors $\{\pm\mathbf{1}_i, i = 1, 2, \ldots, d\}$ that is randomly chosen. But the probability of this choice depend on i. That is for the vector $\mathbf{1}_i$ or $(-\mathbf{1}_i)$ to be chosen this probability is $\alpha_i > 0$, $i = 1, 2, \ldots, d$, and $2\sum_{i=1}^{d} \alpha_i = 1$.

The way of the proof of the basic result in [1] enables us to conclude that (5.12) is satisfied for any symmetric random walk, and the limit as $N \to \infty$ applied to (5.12) remain the ratio in (5.12) unchanged. This property enables us to conjecture that the conditional expectations $\mathsf{E}\{f(\mathbf{n}) \mid \tau < \infty\}$ for symmetric random walks must inherit the main property of the Pólya random walk, that is to take the same constant value for all $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$. However, the further detailed analysis of state-crossings for symmetric random walks should be provided in future work.

References

[1] Abramov, V.M. On the connection between Pólya type random walks and birth-and-death processes. ArXiv 1601.02297v3.

[2] Abramov, V.M. Takács' asymptotic theorem and its applications. A survey.*Acta Appl. Math.*, **109** (2010) 609-651. MR 2585807

[3] Abramov, V.M. *Queueing Systems, Networks and Telecommunication Systems*. Lambert Academic Publ., Saarbrücken, 2009.

[4] Abramov, V.M. Characterization theorem on losses in $GI^X/GI^Y/1/n$ queues. *Operat. Res. Lett.* **41** (2013), 150-152. MR 3023905

[5] Novak, J. Pólya random walk theorem. *Amer. Mathem. Monthly*, **121** (8) (2014), 711-716. MR 3318481

[6] Pólya, G. Über eine Aufgabe der Wahrscheinlichkeits betreffend die Irrfahrt im Strassennetz. *Math. Ann.*, **84** (1921), 149-160. MR 1512028

[7] Szekély, G.J. *Paradoxes in Probability Theory and Mathematical Statistics*. Akademiai Kiado, Budapest, 1986. MR 0880020

[8] Spitzer, F. *Principles of Random Walk*, 2nd edn. Springer, Heidelberg, 2001. MR 0388547

[9] Weisstein, E.W. Pólya random walk constants. From MathWorld–A Wolfram Web Resource. http://mathworld.wolfram.com/PolyasRandomWalkConstants.html

[10] Wolff, R.W. *Stochastic Modeling and the Theory of Queues*. Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, 1989. MR 1022666

24 Sagan Drive, North Cranbourne, Victoria - 3977, Australia

E-mail address: VABRAMOV126@gmail.com